the African Communist

No 21 April / June 1965

ICHTERAKIA

he Revolutionary haracter of the Algiers harter HENRI ALLEG

PRICE

Africa, 1*s. per copy. Elsewhere,* 1*s.* 6*d. or from local bookshops for the equivalent in local currency*

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION

Africa, 4*s. per year (four issues) post free. Elsewhere,* 6*s., or U.S.* $1. *Airmail,* 15*s. or U.S.* $2.50

AGENTS

Usual trade discount (one-third of retail price) to bookshops and sellers ordering 12 *or more copies*

EDITORIAL

Articles, letters, material for articles and comment are invited on all themes of African interest, but payment is by prior arrangement only

ADDRESS

All letters, subscriptions and other correspondence must be sent to the distributor:

Ellis Bowles, 52 Palmerston Road,
London, S.W.14, England

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

Published quarterly in the interests of African solidarity, and as a forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout our Continent, by the South African Communist Party

No 21 April-June 1965

Contents

5 EDITORIAL NOTES

THE U.S. WAR ON VIETNAM

13 FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY

MESSAGE TO VIETNAM
FRENCH AND SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNISTS MEET

16 ICHTIRAKYA!

Henri Alleg

28 PIO PINTO: SON OF AFRICA

Romesh Chandra

32 SOUTH WEST AFRICA—THE HOUR OF DECISION

Sol Dubula

41 NIGERIA AFTER THE ELECTIONS

51 THE INDIAN SCENE TODAY

Mohit Sen

62 DEMOCRACY AND AFRICA

71 AFRICA

NOTES ON CURRENT EVENTS

78 DOCUMENTS

MESSAGE FROM BRAM FISCHER
CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

86 SOUTH AFRICAN LITERATURE—A REJOINDER

Joseph Mofolo Bulane

Editorial Notes:

The U.S. War on Vietnam

On February 7, 1965, on the orders of President Johnson, jet planes took off from aircraft carriers of the U.S. Seventh Fleet anchored in the South China Sea. They bombed a number of areas in North Vietnam, including the hospital of Dong Hoi. And since then, up to the time these lines are being written, the attacks have continued. There has been no formal declaration of war—but in fact and in law the United States is waging war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It is a particularly cowardly and ruthless type of war, waged by aerial bombing and indiscriminate killing of the civilian population, men, women and children.

Nobody, not even the Americans, believes the lie that these savage and lawless attacks are a 'retaliation' for the heavy defeat which the South Vietnam puppet troops and their United States backers suffered on February 7, when 234 Americans were killed and 31 aircraft destroyed. This defeat took place at Pleiku, far south of Saigon; it was inflicted by South Vietnam guerillas fighting with American arms captured from the enemy. The Americans have been preparing for, and even talking about, attacking North Vietnam for a long time. They have been intervening openly in Vietnam for many years, especially since the French collapse at Dien Bien Phu.

Until now there has been the pretence that the United States was merely providing 'aid' to the 'Government' of South Vietnam; that their troops were only 'advisers.' The pretence wore thinner as the rival cliques of traitor politicians and generals in Saigon, entirely lacking mass support, vied among themselves for the chance of selling their country and collecting the rewards. Every other week there was a new 'coup', a new 'government' claiming to be best able to carry out the will of the U.S. Embassy. The pretence that anyone really governed in Saigon except the Americans became so transparent that it would have been ludicrous, were it not so tragic in its consequences and so wounding to the national dignity of the Vietnamese and all oppressed peoples. With every week that passed the Americans and the Vietnamese mercenaries they employed to fight for them became more demoralised; the spirit and skill of the revolutionary guerillas in the national liberation army rose higher and higher, gaining victory after victory. It seemed clear that the end of the long agony was in sight, the beginning of a united, independent peaceful and neutral Vietnam, as envisaged at the international Geneva conference of 1954.

It was at this stage that the government of the United States threw overboard the whole pretence of 'aid' to the alleged 'Saigon government' behind which they had been conducting a colonial war of conquest. The role of advisers is forgotten, and U.S. regular troops and airforce units have openly taken over the conduct of the war. They are making one attack after another on the people and territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, a socialist country. These acts of brazen aggression face the world with a war crisis the like of which it has not seen since Hitler let loose the second world war. United States imperialism and its west European partners have been engaged almost continuously in colonial wars for the past twenty years, but we shall fail to assess the crisis now precipitated by the U.S.A. at its full significance if we do not recognise that the February attack on Vietnam marks a different and terribly dangerous phase. It is an inescapable challenge to international law, to the United Nations and to all that has at least, thus far, maintained the world in a precarious balance this side of nuclear annihilation.

Hitherto (except in the case of the U.S.-Belgian intervention in the Congo last November, which was a warning and a foreshadowing of Vietnam) the imperialist states have attempted to cover up their innumerable acts of aggression with at least some appearance of respect for legality and the United Nations. Even in the case of the aggression against North Korea, use was made of a rigged majority at the United Nations and advantage was taken of the temporary absence of the Soviet Union from the Security Council. It was a hypocritical show of 'respect' for international law on the part of the imperialists, whose only law has always been their own profit and advantage. But this very hypocrisy was the tribute that vice pays to virtue; it was at least a recognition that there are laws of international conduct which apply to all; that there are procedures which are binding on all countries for the negotiation and settlement of disputes. With the aggression against North Vietnam, the United States has torn up all these rules and procedures which she herself helped to frame and swore to uphold in the founding of the United Nations; rules of civilised conduct which, though they were disregarded many times by the imperialists, at least opened the prospect of a world in which small nations, as well as big ones, have some rights; rules under which violations of human rights, such as apartheid, can be exposed and checked; rules under which mankind has at least some hope of avoiding a new global conflict in which, with the help of the physicists, chemists and biologists, the dead would be counted not, as last time, in their tens of millions but in their hundreds of millions.

With the opening of aggression against Vietnam, the United States has scrapped all these rules and safeguards and opened the floodgates of war. She has served notice on the world that henceforth the only rule is 'might is right'. The Geneva Agreements on Vietnam were ignored. The United Nations was ignored. The mass protests all over the world were ignored. The attempted counsels of moderation from U Thant and even from America's NATO allies are rudely brushed aside. With an arrogant contempt for international law and international opinion the like of which has not been experienced since the days of Hitler and Mussolini, President Johnson and his Wall Street masters are telling the world: to hell with your law and your United Nations; we shall do as we please because we are rich and strong and ruthless enough to get away with it.

Gangster Philosophy

This gangster philosophy fully reflects the present position of the ruling forces in the United States of America. The giant monopolies which control this most advanced and powerful of imperialist countries have grown in power, arrogance and desperation until they consider themselves completely beyond the law and the government of their own or any other country.

The Negro people and their White supporters, claiming the elementary citizenship rights to which the Constitution entitles them, are murdered, gassed and savagely clubbed before the television lenses and the eyes of the world.

The assassin's bullet has become the commonplace of American politics; and none is safe from it, be he a President Kennedy or the militant spokesman of the oppressed Americans of African descent, Malcolm X.

Symbolic of gangster law in the United States is the Central Intelligence Agency, monstrously subsidised by the American state, yet subject to no public scrutiny or control, utterly unscrupulous, reckless, a law unto itself. The C.I.A. does not restrict its operations to the United States of America. Its tentacles reach out into the whole of the Americas and the Caribbean. It organised the invasion of Guatemala and the overthrow of the legitimate government. It organised the 'Bay of Pigs' adventure—an attempted invasion of socialist Cuba which was ignominiously crushed by the people's government.

All over the world, far from the shores of the United States, the C.I.A. and other U.S. or U.S.-sponsored organisations are working feverishly in defence of imperialism and reaction everywhere; against the forces of national liberation and socialism. Their weapons are intrigue, bribery and corruption, and plain political murder. They infiltrate through the International Confederation of 'Free' Trade Unions and the Peace Corps, through American diplomatic and commercial missions, through local politicians and gangsters on their payroll. They succeeded in strangling the newborn African democracy in the Congo (Leopoldville.) Though the hands that struck down Lumumba in the Congo and in Burundi and now the patriot Pio Pinto in Nairobi may have been African hands, the dollars that paid for these crimes and the methods of political gangsterism which they expressed were made in the U.S.A.

The Imperialist Counter-Offensive In Africa

It is high time for all African statesmen and patriots to pay far more serious attention to the imperialist counter-offensive which has already begun in Africa.

Its most blatant and open expression, at the moment, has been the Congo aggression, jointly planned by United States, Belgian and British imperialism last November. But that was far from being the only, or even the most dangerous, expression of imperialist intervention on our continent.

President Nyerere did a public service to Africa last year when he drew public attention to the American plot against Tanzania. It was denied by U.S. diplomats; but knowing of the duplicity and secrecy of the operations of the C.I.A. it is impossible to believe that the diplomats would have admitted the truth of the charges, and doubtful even whether they knew whether they were true or not.

The Tanzania authorities came across but one corner of the web of conspiracy, penetration, economic and political, assassination and aggression that imperialism is spinning in Africa. The more one examines the pattern of events in our continent in the recent months the more it becomes clear that one is no longer dealing with the familiar pattern of the past decade in which the various imperialist powers intervened separately—sometimes at cross purposes—in different parts of our continent, with the general object of holding up the advancing tide of national liberation as best they could.

One is dealing today with a co-ordinated conspiracy of all the main imperialist powers, against Africa as a whole: a conspiracy in which the ringleader is increasingly clearly emerging as United States monopoly capitalism.

The main centre of colonialist and neo-colonialist intrigue in Africa remains where it always was: the white-dominated slave state in the South, with its capital at Pretoria and its links extending to the NATO armed and NATO backed regimes in Salisbury, Angola, Mozambique and Lisbon.

But the new springboard for imperialist penetration lies in the heart of the Continent: the puppet Tshombe regime at Leopoldville. It was in the Congo operation, sailing under the false colours of the United Nations, that the new technique of collective imperialism, in which the mutually-hostile capitalist powers of West Europe and North America, first joined hands to bring about the bloody suppression of the Lumumba Government. It was in the Congo last November that the United States, Belgium and Britain, under the false pretence of a humanitarian mission, helped Tshombe's murdering looting gangs of white mercenaries to capture Stanleyville from the patriots. It is from the Congo today that new aggressions and intrigues are planned and executed, ranging from the bombing of Uganda villages to the staging of a Rightist comeback in Khartoum.

All the main imperialist countries are playing their part in this new counter-offensive.

From Paris and from London powerful pressures have been exerted to split the Organisation of African Unity, to create a new factional line-up of some former French colonies and Nigeria which are prepared to betray Africa by recognising and embracing the Tshombe puppet regime.

In one way or another, the various imperialist powers arm, assist and protect the odious apartheid regime against the world-wide movement for an arms embargo, for sanctions and boycotts. The West German Bonn regime collaborates with Pretoria in illegal nuclear and chemical weapons development. In defiance of the spirit and intention of the Security Council arms embargo, British, United States, French, Belgian and other firms set up or license armaments plants designed to make Verwoerd's Republic self-sufficient in the manufacture of weapons to kill and suppress Africans.

It would be possible to prolong this list of fresh imperialist adventures and intrigues to great length. But enough has been said already to show the main central point: these are not isolated incidents. They form part of a centrally-planned and designed counter-offensive of international imperialism, against Africa and against Asia.

Their immediate objective is to halt the tide of national liberation, to preserve for the imperialists their vast sources of profits in the 'underdeveloped' areas—areas undeveloped precisely because colonialism has stunted and retarded their development.

Their ultimate objective is no less than recolonisation: to destroy the new-won independence and opportunities of rapid advancement which the African and Asian peoples have won after generations of suffering and untold sacrifices.

In the end they are out to achieve what Hitler tried before them:

to establish world domination, even at the cost of a nuclear holocaust.

They Must Be Stopped!

The imperialists cannot hope to succeed in this mad objective. They are confronted by the opposition of the overwhelming majority of the world's inhabitants, to whose interests and whose will the imperialist aims are diametrically opposed. They are confronted by the opposition of the socialist countries—grown since Hitler's day from two to thirteen, and whose inhabitants comprise a third of mankind. They are confronted by the liberated countries of Asia and Africa, whose hundreds of millions of people cannot and will not be turned back from the path of independence and social revolution, and by the insurgent peoples of South and Central America.

Even within the imperialist countries themselves, the majority of the public have decisively rejected the adventurous and warmongering policies which their governments are implementing. In the United States, but a few months ago, the electorate was asked to express its opinion of the fascist proposals of Senator Goldwater, who demanded an aggressive line of action including the stepping up of aggression in Vietnam and the launching of war against the northern Republic. They answered by inflicting the biggest defeat ever on Goldwater and the Republican Party. But President Johnson today is carrying out precisely the policy advocated by Goldwater in the election.

At the same time an election was being held in Britain. The British public was invited to choose between the well-known Tory policy of colonial adventures and subordination of British policy to that of United States imperialism, on the one hand, and on the other the policy of the Labour Party. In opposition, the Labour Party had sharply criticised Tory policy. Many members were publicly identified with the mass movements for peace, against apartheid and other forms of colonialism, and for a progressive anti-monopoly policy at home and abroad. Labour Party and Trade Union Congress conferences voted for such policies. The Labour Party won the majority. But Prime Minister Wilson and the British Labour Party are carrying out precisely the policy of Home, the Man of Munich. Side by side with the dirty war the Americans are conducting in Vietnam, the British are conducting their own dirty war in Malaya. The Wilson government went out of its way to support the American aggression against Vietnam;

it condones West German militarist dreams of territorial aggrandisement in East Europe; it is continuing neo-colonialist adventures in Africa and 'East of Suez.'

There are two aspects to these remarkable phenomena. They show, as we Communists have always affirmed, that bourgeois democracy is a swindle. No matter what the electorate want, or whom they put into the White House or Downing Street, international finance-capital is the real master, treating the wishes of the public with contempt. But they also show that even in their own strongholds the imperialists cannot command the support of the masses for the aggressive criminal adventures which threaten the peace and the very survival of humanity. And once they move into united action, despite the vast economic and state powers the monopolists have concentrated in their hands, the people can assert their will. The united freedom marchers of Selma and elsewhere in the United States have forced the government of that country into unwilling steps to protect Negro rights. Purposeful unity of the people everywhere can force the aggressors out of Vietnam and save world peace.

The converse is also true. Unity in action is our weapon; disunity and passivity help no one but the enemy. It is because the Organisation of African Unity has not thus far continued sufficiently firmly in the Spirit of Addis Ababa that the imperialists have been able to make a comeback in the Congo and elsewhere. It is because the Afro-Asian countries have strayed from the Spirit of Bandung that the imperialists have been able to take advantage of our disunity.

The results have been that the United Nations has been sabotaged, diverted from its purposes into an instrument of imperialist policies, and now reduced to impotence in the face of the severest crisis since its foundation.

The events in Vietnam must serve as a stern warning to all of us that we must close our ranks—the ranks of the great majority of the people everywhere who want peace, national liberation, and advance to socialism. Only in unity can we find the strength to curb international gangsterism and aggression. And if we fail to stop them now, in Vietnam, we shall pay a bitter price in the future in Africa and in every part of the world.

MESSAGE FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the South African Communist Party expresses its unbreakable solidarity with the Government and the people of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on the occasion of the outrageous acts of aggression and war by the United States Air Force on the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

These barbarous bombings are a blatant defiance of the Geneva Agreements and of every principle of international law and civilised conduct. They have aroused the anger and indignation of all the people in every part of the world. By these gangster actions the United States aggressors have gravely increased the danger to peace, the danger of spreading war.

The oppressed and exploited people of South Africa, fighting against a fascist regime which is supported by United States and British imperialism, regard the attacks on our brothers and sisters in Vietnam as attacks on ourselves. We demand that the United States immediately cease its aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw all its forces from South Vietnam, observe the Geneva Agreements and allow the South Vietnam people to decide their own future for themselves.

We express to you, comrades, our admiration, support and comradeship in your long, heroic and continuing struggle for national independence, socialism and a better life for your people.

SOUTH AFRICAN AND FRENCH COMMUNISTS MEET

DURING FEBRUARY 1965, a meeting took place between representatives of the French Communist Party and the South African Communist Party. There was a fruitful exchange of views and information.

The South African delegation highly appreciated the work of the French Communist Party in defence of the interests of the working class, the restoration of democracy and the maintenance of peace; as well as its support for the national liberation struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

The South African delegation presented a detailed analysis of the abominable racialist system which prevails in South Africa. They showed that it constituted a special type of colonialism based on the oppression of the African majority and other non-whites. Verwoerd, Vorster and the other leaders, unrepentant admirers of Hitler, resorted to savage methods of fascist violence.

The French delegation paid tribute to the South African resistance movement, uniting Communists and non-Communists in a heroic struggle for freedom and equal rights and opportunities for all. Both delegations welcomed the solidarity movement which has developed all over the world. They consider that the racist regime of Verwoerd would find it hard to maintain itself in power, without the political support, the arms and the capital provided by the imperialist countries, including France. In defiance of solemn United Nations decisions, the French government continues to supply arms to South Africa to repress the liberation forces. French investments in South Africa, and trade between the two countries, are on the increase.

The French delegation considers that this policy is not only injurious to good relations between France and the countries of Africa and Asia; it is also contrary to the national interests of the French people. Both delegations considered the struggle against apartheid a question of world importance, not only for the defence of fundamental human rights but also for the defence of peace. The government of South Africa constitutes a menace to world peace and to the independence and security of every African country. The South African state, the most industrialised in Africa, is mobilising for war. With the aid of firms in Britain, France (such as Panhard) and elsewhere it is actually building a self-contained armaments industry. There is a secret agreement between the Bonn and Pretoria governments for the joint production in South Africa of nuclear weapons, missiles and poison gases. The Pretoria regime has close military ties with Salazar Portugal and the racist government of Rhodesia.

The representatives of the French Communist Party undertake to do all in their power to develop a broad and powerful movement in France against apartheid. The French Communist Party, together with all other democratic forces, will intensify the struggle to end the French government's support for the racist and aggressive regime in South Africa. In particular, the Party will campaign:

—for the freeing of all political prisoners in South Africa ;

—for observance by France of the Security Council call for an embargo on arms destined for South Africa ;

—for the French government to break off all diplomatic, commercial, cultural, sporting and other relations with the apartheid regime ; and

—for effective United Nations action against the illegal annexation of South-West Africa by South Africa.

The talks were held in a spirit of great cordiality and comradeship, and both delegations were convinced of the need to develop further contacts and fraternal co-operation between the two Parties.

ICHTIRAKYA

THE REVOLUTIONARY CHARACTER OF THE ALGIERS CHARTER

Henri Alleg

ICHTIRAKYA! As soon as national liberation was proclaimed this word swept through the whole of Algeria. It was inscribed on every banner, it climaxed every demonstration, it was used to end every proclamation. It inspired the masses with the same enthusiasm as yesterday 'independence' had done. It means: socialism.

For the workers and poor peasants, this watchword answered a profound desire to build a new society, free from the injustice and capitalist oppression of which the colonial regime had presented so cruel and repulsive an example.

To be sure, this affirmation, often repeated, that Algeria had chosen socialism was met with some scepticism even in friendly circles abroad. It was said, and truly, that before Algeria, many leaders of the countries of the Third World had brandished the flag of 'socialism'—though it was intended only to disguise old wares and to deceive the masses by playing on their growing attraction towards socialism.

It was the Algerian people who replied to these fears and showed that what was happening in their country could in no way be compared to the course followed in certain other African states. They replied by building in record time a socialist sector of the economy based on thousands of agricultural, commercial and industrial enterprises which had been abandoned by the colonialists.

This 'spontaneous' action of the masses was subsequently legalized and institutionalized by the government, and also extended to other sectors. In this way all the French settlers were expropriated, as well as very many Algerian collaborators who had betrayed the national cause.

Three million hectares of the best land were taken over under the collective control of the workers organized in self-management committees.

As regards buildings, in the Algiers area alone, more than 200,000 houses, flats, shops and offices became state property, and the new tenants pay their rent to the state.

Thus, from the beginning of independence the revolution made its impact on life, but the actual 'Algerian way' to socialism still had to be clearly defined. It was necessary to draw up a programme which would formulate the perspectives leading to socialism not on a basis of idealistic and moral aspirations, but on the objective study of realities.

The need for such a programme, which had long been apparent to the most far-sighted revolutionary militants of the National Liberation Front (F.L.N.) led to the F.L.N. Congress of April 1964 which adopted *the Programme and Constitution now known as the Algiers Charter.*

SOME SPECIAL FEATURES

Before I give a—necessarily brief and sketchy—outline of the Charter, I should give some picture of the particular conditions in which the Algerian revolution developed.

1. The far-reaching European penetration into Algeria prevented the formation of a strong national bourgeoisie there. Even the embryonic commercial bourgeoisie which existed at the time of the conquest was destroyed and the Europeans monopolized all the privileged economic positions. So the national liberation struggle was not led by the big capitalists, as had been the case in certain countries of the Maghreb; it always had strong roots among the people. The fight against the oppressor was at the same time a fight against the land-grabbers and the exploiting European bosses, and in the mind of the poor peasant and the worker action against foreign capitalist exploitation was soon identified with action against exploitation of all kinds. During the war years this popular feeling was reflected in the often repeated phrase: *We are not fighting in order to replace the French boss by an Arab boss.*

This explains why, straight after liberation, the movement for the complete transformation of society and a régime not based on exploitation took an extraordinary leap forward. It also explains the weakness of the national bourgeoisie and its inability to resist the powerful impetus of a nation which had been, so to speak, almost entirely 'proletarianized' by the colonial regime.

2. Algeria was deeply attached to the traditions of Arab-Islamic civilization. In the face of colonialist attempts at Christianization and depersonalization, Islam was one of the factors that held the nation together and helped to keep live the spirit of resistance to imperialism. Protests against colonial oppression, and in the same way after independence the aspirations for a society free from exploitation of man by man, expressed themselves under the banner of religion.

For most of the agricultural workers, for instance, taking over the land of the settlers and the traitors appeared not only as a revolutionary task but also as an action quite in accordance with their Islamic faith and with the 'hadith' of the Koran: The land belongs to him who makes it bear fruit.

3. The Algerian Revolution has developed and is developing within the framework of the compromise Treaty of Evian. Contrary to what happened in Cuba, where the aggressive attitude of the U.S.A. speeded up the revolutionary process, there was no abrupt break with imperialism in Algeria. Indeed, the French Government seems to have drawn the lessons from the American failure in Cuba. The French Minister of Algerian Affairs stated when he replied to a senator who was asking for a tougher policy towards Algeria: 'that we must not play in Algeria the same role that America played in Cuba': 'A different attitude' said the minister in substance, would only result in the Algerian revolution going 'further and quicker'.

Though the French rulers have followed a deliberate line, it should be said also that Algeria is looking for genuine co-operation, while being on her guard against the dangers that co-operation hides. The immediate consequences of an abrupt break with France would greatly complicate Algeria's task, particularly in the economic field. Nevertheless, amidst this compromise, the ultimate goal is and will remain total disengagement from the economic grip of imperialism.

4. Finally, although today Algeria is resolutely advancing along the non-capitalist path of development, where socialism has become her watchword, she does not yet have a powerful vanguard party based on scientific principles which would be capable of leading the revolution. After independence, the F.L.N. carried on as it had done during the war, as a union of all the patriotic forces interested in liberating the country. This does not mean that all the supporters of the F.L.N. were necessarily partisans of socialism. It was possible to overthrow colonialism without a vanguard party, but everyone realises that it is impossible to build the foundation for socialist society without such a party.

It was the task of the April Congress of the F.L.N. to mark out the way to build this party, uniting on a class basis the people who were the most far-sighted and devoted to the revolution so that they could lead Algeria on her difficult march towards complete freedom from imperialist chains and towards socialism.

THE F.L.N. CONGRESS AND THE ALGIERS CHARTER

While they take into account national conditions and are at the same time impregnated with scientific thought, the texts which were adopted at the F.L.N. Congress (the Algiers Charter), taken together, appear as '*a political and social vision derived from our own values,* *fed on scientific principles and forearmed against mistaken attitudes of mind'*.

Those who drew up the clauses of the Charter high-lighted the necessity for the revolution both to integrate itself into the world trend to socialism and to take root in Algerian national conditions.

Taking these conditions into account means primarily defining the stage which the revolution has reached in Algeria. Even though the Evian Treaty was imposed on Algeria by French imperialism at the end of an extraordinary struggle of eight years carried on against the largest colonial army of all time, it was none the less a compromise, and a compromise has its negative and its positive aspects for both sides. The negative aspect for Algeria is that the agreement preserves certain links and privileges to the benefit of France. Thus the Charter underlines that fact that, in the present situation, '*imperialism is still the major enemy*' but '*the struggle for the consolidation of independence and the struggle for the triumph of the socialist option are indissolubly linked*'.

Since the essential aspect of the struggle is still the anti-imperialist fight, one must therefore take an energetic stand '*against those who want gradually to weaken our will to break away from imperialism*'.

Imperialism has its allies in this country. A section of the Algerian bourgeoisie, even if a weak one, aspires not to help the country's progress towards socialism, but to take possession of part of the '*national heritage which was saved by the sacrifices of the peasants and workers*'. Some of these elements have slipped into the machinery of the State and are hindering the advance of the revolution, thus objectively becoming allies of imperialism. It is necessary to attack them, but this does not mean that the middle and lower middle layers in the towns and in the country can all be 'lumped together' since they themselves are victims of the capitalist system. Any mistake in this field could result in pushing them into counter-revolutionary positions.

HOW TO ENSURE THE FINAL TRIUMPH OF THE REVOLUTION

Whom should the revolution rely on?

The Algiers Charter answers this question: above all on the workers in town and country. These are the people who took over the property of the settlers and the French employers, and who through their management committees in the farms and industrial enterprises form the 'spinal column' of the new Algeria, for of all people they are most interested in the success of socialism.

'*The role of the urban workers,*' reads the Charter, '*together with the agricultural workers of the self-management sector, is going to become more and more important, for the revolutionary State can only* *have as its social foundation the working masses allied with the poor peasants of the traditional sector and with the revolutionary elements among the intellectuals.*'

For the power of the working masses will be exercised—through the agency of the revolutionary State, a new kind of State:

'*The choice of socialism includes the necessity to build a State of a new kind, which will express the interests of the peasants and workers and become more and more an instrument of production and not of coercion.*'

In the meantime, the '*producers' State*' must be defended, and this is being done through '*the dictatorship of the poor, the fellahs, and the workers*', in President Ben Bella's phrase.

Thus the Algiers Charter gives a class analysis of the State, which follows scientific socialism. This brings us to another question: what, at the present time, is the nature of the Algerian State?

Part of the answer is provided by the series of decrees which took away land and industrial enterprises from the European settlers and employers, seized wrongly acquired property and prohibited its passing into the hands of the Algerian bourgoisie. However, it must not be forgotten that there is another strong deprived capitalist sector and that '*immediately following independence, the State structure and its human components formed in part, with the exception of the National Army of the People, one of the legacies of colonialism, of which objectively they expressed the ideas and methods. This heritage kept alive habits and manners of administration which make the State apparatus act as a brake on the realization of the aims of the revolution.*'

The struggle between the revolutionary forces and the conservative forces which are directly or indirectly allied to imperialism is still being carried on at the heart of the State apparatus. That is why the Algiers Congress laid down as one of the necessary tasks not only the purging but the complete transformation of the administration. For '*this is the bureaucratic sector where the interests, customs and methods threatened by the revolution will endeavour to hide themselves*'.

Elsewhere, the Charter lays down the economic tasks during the building of socialism, and points out:

'*The suppression of economic exploitation and the abolition of colonial and neo-colonial ties, the expropriation of dominant foreign capital, the agricultural revolution, the socialization of the means of production, will enable us to put an end to economic anarchy and will make possible efficient and harmonious planning based on the true interests of the community*'.

Thus in order to ensure the final victory of socialism it is necessary in the political field to secure the power of the true and natural proponents of socialism, that is to say the power of the town and country workers together with the mass of poor peasants and the revolutionary intellectuals, progressively to abolish '*exploitable private property*' and to arrive at collectivization and the socialization of the means of production.

It is in the self-management sector that the battle can first be won, for as the text points out it is '*the real spring of the political and economic life of the country*' and its development must '*progressively lessen the role and influence of the private sector*'.

Parallel to this, a thorough-going agrarian reform must be carried out; in fact, it is better to speak of an agrarian revolution which will destroy the basis of feudalism and of the great landed properties, while drawing the peasant masses to the socialist revolution. President Ben Bella, in the speech he made on October 27th, 1963, to the Congress of Agricultural Self-Management, gave a general outline of his programme which was later confirmed by the April Congress:

The question is, he said, '*to set a limit to private property in such a way that the constitution of a privileged class becomes impossible, to lay down a modern land law for the whole of our country adapted to the demands of our revolution, and to create new ways for Algerian agriculture to work on these two foundations: collective cultivation through self-management, and small family farms*'.

In fact agrarian reform must take into account '*the desire of the fellahs to own land of which they have been too long deprived. However, simple re-distribution of the land would be an uneconomic enterprise if it were not accompanied by measures which in the end go beyond this kind of expropriation*'.

Thus as soon as the agrarian law becomes operative, co-operatives will be established alongside the farms under self-management, and these will become the centres of organization not only for the eventual beneficiaries of the reform but also for the remaining small proprietors.

As for foreign economic aid, the Charter observes that it must be considered as a palliative, merely as additional income which is contributed to the basic income from the national effort. It is clear that blind acceptance of foreign aid from capitalist countries can only compromise the political and economic independence of the country in the more or less distant future. For this reason external trade must be started up '*as soon as possible*'. Any formula like 'a society based on a mixed economy' must be avoided at all costs, adds the Charter, for it would end in the resurgence of capitalism in the key sectors of the Algerian economy.

FOREIGN POLICY

'*Two facts dominate international relations: the advance of the democratic socialist forces shown in the stress on anti-imperialist struggles, the accession to independence of new States, the economic development of the socialist countries and the strengthening of the struggle by democratic movements on the one hand and the continual reduction of the imperialist sphere of influence on the other.*'

On the basis of this definition, the Algiers Charter could only reach one conclusion: internationally Algeria must stand on the side of the Arab, African and Asian peoples fighting against imperialism, on the side of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and on the side of the democratic forces of the world.

Socialism can only be built under peaceful conditions. Thus, the defence of world peace will be a constant factor in the determination of Algerian foreign policy:

'*The advance of the anti-imperialist forces to world stature is making imperialism seek forcible solutions to the problem of securing its hegemony; this is the origin of the arms race and the manufacture of atomic weapons with a capacity for massive destruction, whose existence puts humanity in grave danger. The elimination of the atomic menace and the final cessation of all experiments, including underground ones, would fulfil the spirit of the Moscow treaty. Peace and disarmament are necessary for extending co-operation between nations and would create favourable conditions for settling questions in dispute.*'

Thus the F.L.N. Charter has appropriated the idea that the struggle for peace and the struggle for national liberation are complementary, not opposed. '*In those countries which are not yet independent,*' reads the Charter, '*armed struggle can be decisive in the attainment of national sovereignty. . . . The people's revolutionary struggles are one of the surest and most efficient guarantees against the attempts of imperialism to loose a nuclear holocaust on the world.*'

Nevertheless, the F.L.N. Congress points out that imperialism still has considerable capacity to adapt itself. The Charter says that the utmost vigilance must be observed over the '*resources for adaptation that imperialism has at its disposal to modify its methods of exploitation and to slow up the course of events*', which makes possible '*the preservation of the hegemony of the imperialist countries in new guises*'.

In Africa examples are not lacking to illustrate this proposition, and recent events in the Congo have shown what independence is worth in a country which has a Tshombe at its head. Neo-colonialism—meaning oppression adapted to today's conditions—threatens nearly all the countries who have recently won or rewon their sovereignty but who have not yet been able to break their former bonds completely. The Algiers Charter rightly emphasizes the need to struggle for '*structural disengagement from imperialism*' . . . '*an absolute condition for the consolidation of national independence and the liberation of oppressed countries*'.

THE PARTY AS MAINSPRING OF THE REVOLUTION

How can all these tasks be carried out? How can progress be made in building the new society?

As Ben Bella said in his report to the Congress, a new society '*needs a mainspring, the mainspring of one party only, one party which is fully aware of the needs of the working masses, which is determined, and capable of translating all popular initiative into its true course*'.

However, the Congress did not set up this party. It only provided the political, ideological and administrative basis on which to build (though this is a considerable step forward). The Charter gives a general outline and a framework for action which is valuable for all revolutionaries who believe in socialism. It thus creates the conditions for organic fusion of *all* the revolutionary forces (including the communists) in a single powerful party which would be in the vanguard of progress and whose aim would be, as set out in the adopted text: '*to build a society from which all kinds of exploitation of man by man will be banned, to build a socialist society*'.

Clearly this means that '*the elements hostile to this transformation*' who existed in the old F.L.N. during the war will find no place in the party. In this connection clause No. 7 of the Algiers Charter underlines the proposition that '*the union of all forces which was an indispensable instrument of the armed struggle should be reconsidered in the light of the objectives and perspectives of the socialist revolution. Such a union has had its day. To keep it could only result in confusion and unhealthy compromise.*'

Ahmed Ben Bella added in his opening speech:

'*Today, there is no question of resuscitating the old structure of the F.L.N. but of building on what already exists to make an intrument fitted to defend and consistently to foster socialism*'.

When it was reconsidering the nature and objectives of the party, the Congress was also induced to define what social composition it should have to enable it to play its part. Clause 15, on the party, recommends '*scrupulous care to see that the social composition of the party is based on the producers and the urban and rural workers*'. The General Secretary of the F.L.N. also emphasizes in his report that '*the party cannot allow exploiters to penetrate its ranks without running the risk of degenerating and becoming a bourgeois party*'.

However, there is a danger in the one party system. This danger has taken shape in certain African countries where the bourgeoisie, allegedly in the name of national unity, have used the single party to defend interests which are not the interests of the most exploited masses. In this regard the Charter states that the best way of eliminating this risk is to keep the party constantly in touch with the masses and controlled by them. Machinery must not be constructed, says the text '*which may express the aspirations of the masses at first but then evolves independently of them*' which could only end '*sooner or later, either in the dictatorship of the petty bourgeoisie or in the establishment of a bureaucratic class using the machinery to further its own interests, or again in a régime of personal dictatorship making the party into a mere organ of the political police*'.

No revolutionary can fail to grasp the importance of the Charter, for it places Algeria in the vanguard of the African continent. This brief analysis of the text shows that the Algerian revolution has not only assimilated the wealth of international socialist theory and experience but is also, out of experience in Algeria itself, making its own invaluable contribution.

This fact was underlined in the common communiqué signed at the outcome of the discussions between Algeria and the Soviet Union, which emphasized the positive contribution Algeria has made to international socialism.

The leaders of the revolution do not deny the influence of scientific socialism (as bourgeois Western journalists discovered with comical terror when they read these texts).

On several occasions President Ben Bella himself has said that he took his political and economic analysis from Marxism, though as a Moslem he could not follow Marxist philosophical conclusions. This is no doubt one of the most novel features of our revolution. A whole people is on the march, and a party is being forged which will ensure the victory of true socialism based on scientific principles (as Ben Bella has said, 'there is only one socialism'). Yet the leadership rejects the materialist philosophy. However, this clearly will not provoke any split in the ranks of the revolutionaries. The important thing for them is to unite and fight together '*to build heaven on earth*'. The party, in its advance along the path mapped out by the Algiers Charter, is the rallying-point where they will gather and together wipe out all prejudice and sectarianism which might oppose or divide them, for the only valid criterion of a militant in the new party is devotion to the cause of socialism. Here communist Algerian militants will have a particularly useful role. Their knowledge of scientific socialist principles, their great experience of organization, their spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to the revolution will be of enormous value.

THE PRESENT STAGE

It would be only too easy to elaborate on the gap which separates reality in an Algeria still suffering the consequences of 125 years of colonial domination and eight years of cruel warfare from the ambitious aims laid down by the Algiers Charter. But this would be unfair to Algeria. The proper question to ask is whether the chosen path is being followed and progress being made towards the objective.

The answer can only be in the affirmative.

The revolution is advancing and consolidating itself even though there are many difficulties and the path is not always straight. This is so both objectively on the facts and subjectively in the minds of the militants who are constantly gaining from the lessons of their experience a clearer and more realistic view of socialism and the ways to it.

Of course, all sectarianism and exclusivism has not been destroyed, nor all false ideas eradicated. In certain situations they could even start growing again, but then no one has ever thought that for a Congress to adopt a text was enough to transform it by magic into reality. Only the day-to-day struggle of the masses will defeat the egotistic interests and prejudices which hinder the march forward and especially the building of a progressive party which will act as the instrument of the socialist revolution and make the content of the Algiers Charter into a fact.

A quick look at the months following the April Congress will show that important steps along the way have already been taken.

The principal fact is the great success achieved through the liquidation of the counter-revolutionary army. Western circles (notably certain French and West German right-wing groupings), hankering after *Algerie francaise*, as well as the reactionary wing of the local bourgeoisie, had built a lot of hopes on this army. They saw Chaabani (a feudal land-owner from the South) and Ait Ahmed (son of a noble family), who stood out against the revolution, as potential Tshombes. However, the attempts to 'Congolize Algeria' were thwarted after the People's National Army had captured the two men. In any case, they had never succeeded in attracting the masses to their support in spite of their demagogic appeals to the regionalist feelings that the colonialists had always nourished. The revolutionary government came out of this political battle strengthened and with increased prestige.

In the economic field, the socialist sector whose failure was forecast by the prophets has successfully withstood all attacks and all the attempts at sabotage inspired by foreign or Algerian private capital, and has extended its influence throughout the country.

During the last anniversary meeting on the 1st November, President Ben Bella was able to announce that 70 per cent of agricultural production was now supplied by the self-management sector.

Nevertheless, Algeria still depends largely on France for her imports and exports. She is equally bound by the aid she receives from the U.S.A. in the form of food. The aim is obviously to break away from this dangerous hold.

This is particularly true of oil. In spite of threats and difficulties in this field, Algeria is going ahead with her plans: to recover her national riches and use them to develop the country. At the end of September Ahmed Ben Bella inaugurated a factory for liquefying gas at Arzew and operations for laying a third oil-pipe at Haoud-el-Hamra-Arzew. In the near future this pipe-line will have alongside it another pipe for butane and propane gas. Both pipes will finish at the coast, for commercial purposes, but this time it will be for the benefit of Algeria and not for the capitalist companies.

The President of the Republic took advantage of this opportunity to reaffirm clearly the fundamental attitudes of the Algiers Charter, and the inspiration of his speech is to be found in the following passage:

'*Algeria made too many sacrifices for political liberation not to proceed as quickly as possible to economic liberation, which is what really counts in the eyes of the masses of Africa, Asia and Latin America. We ourselves are convinced that we have chosen the right way, even though it may upset certain private interests, for the private companies take their methods from foreign soil and their inspiration from ideas bound up with the colonial tradition, and their only business is amassing profits.*

'*In the case of oil, our position is clear and not open to any doubt. Algerian gas, like all national resources, is the property of the State, and the State will allocate it first for use and conversion on the spot, and then for export to foreign countries who wish to sign long-term contracts with Algeria designed to guarantee the security of their supplies.*'

It is not only a question of selling raw materials, for Algeria must use these materials on the spot so that she can start industrialization and put an end to unemployment. Soon both a national refinery and a fertilizer factory will be built at Arzew. These two enterprises will constitute the nucleus of a large oil and chemical industry.

One of the most important factors in the struggle for economic liberation are the bonds of friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries. The training of numerous experts with experience of hydrocarbon is a necessity, for without them Algeria will never be able to exploit her wealth. Thanks to the Soviet Union, an African Hydrocarbon Institute started work in October at Bou Merdes (thirty-seven miles from Algiers) and more than 2,000 students are attending courses given by Soviet professors. At the same time, following the Algerian-Soviet agreement, a Textile Institute opened near Algiers at Bordj el Bahri. The first Algerian steelworks whose annual production will be from 300,000 to 350,000 tons of steel will be built at Annaba with the aid of a loan of 20 million roubles from the U.S.S.R. Other financial, commercial and cultural agreements have been or are to be signed with the socialist countries. They help develop the country, strengthen Algerian independence and frustrate possible imperialist blackmail.

In the field of foreign policy, Algeria has also kept to the Algiers Charter and has put herself at the head of the fight for national liberation and unity of the African and Arab peoples. At Addis Ababa during the O.A.U. conference, at Cairo at the conference of non-aligned countries, and at the UN during the debate on imperialist intervention in the Congo, Algeria's voice has rung out for the cause of independence and in defence of peace. In spite of her own difficulties, Algeria has concretely demonstrated her solidarity with the Congolese patriots in the fight against Tshombe and his mercenaries. Several months ago Algiers became a place of refuge and support for patriots expelled from their own countries by colonialism and fascism.

Similarly, relations with working class movements in capitalist countries, especially communist parties, are being organized and built up from mutual interest. Delegations from the French and Italian communist parties have been received in the past few months by the F.L.N. party, and common communiqués showing agreement on essential political problems and outlining ways of co-operation between each of the parties and the F.L.N. have been signed. The right-wing French press was astonished at these friendly links between the F.L.N. and the French Communist Party. President Ben Bella replied that it is natural for men and parties who hold the same socialist beliefs to join their efforts.

The enthusiasm of the masses is bound to grow and pessimism and doubt bound to be routed when so much progress has been made in applying the Algiers Charter. The enthusiasm (even if it is not 'explosive' as elsewhere) shows itself in voluntary work, such as the campaign for planting trees, when hundreds of thousands of men and women, young and old, gathered together to plant millions of trees to replace the forests which had been destroyed by the settlers or by French napalm bombs.

Workers in the town and country are the first to give an example of dedication, for they know that the revolution belongs to them and it is their task to defend it and make it advance. They know the necessity for strong vital trade union organizations and for a revolutionary party to lead them and of which they will constitute the essential foundation. Thus Algeria is now undergoing a period of organization: everywhere meetings are being held to form party branches; every week there is a conference for trade unionists, for young people, for women. People speak more and more openly of what is right and what is not right, they are not afraid to denounce faults or to criticize those responsible and the authoritarian methods which have not yet altogether disappeared.

People are not afraid to ask for a reckoning and to put forward ideas, as if the whole country wants to justify these points in the Algiers Charter:

'*The struggle for the victory of democratic principles has penetrated to the masses, motivated their acts and determined their behaviour and ideas. Armed resistance to French imperialism has made them aware of their strength and of their ability to resolve their problems themselves. . . . The history of our people teaches us the importance of democracy. The party must always, without exception, put its trust in the masses.*'

It is true that enemy intrigue and sabotage, various obstacles, and the consequences of old methods and prejudices hindering the formation of a progressive party could slow up the revolution or even put a halt to it.

But one thing that is sure at the beginning of this new year is that Algeria has started out on the right path. From now on nothing can make her retrace her steps. She will advance irresistibly along the way marked out: the way of socialism.

Algiers, December 1964.

PIO PINTO: SON OF AFRICA

Romesh Chandra

THERE IS MOURNING IN KENYA. One of the bravest of her sons is no more, one of the fighters who helped to win independence for Kenya lies buried under the soil he loved so dearly.

Yes, Pio Pinto was a son of Africa. Elected to Parliament of Kenya, he was loved and respected by vast masses of Kenyan patriots. One of the staunchest leaders of the Kenyan African National Union (KANU)—the party of freedom built by Jomo Kenyatta and Oginga Odinga—Pio had spent many years in British prisons for the cause of Kenya' s emancipation.

He died too for Africa: he was shot dead by the agents of imperialism—the imperialism, to vanquish which Pio dedicated his entire life.

* * *

There is mourning in India too. For in Pio's veins ran Indian blood. A Goan by birth, this martyr for Africa's liberation, had his education in Bombay. Pio found no difficulty in identifying himself completely with the African cause: an anti-imperialist fighter for the same cause, wherever he may be. And the African fighters took Pio to their hearts, and with Pio they took to their hearts, the real India, the staunchly anti-imperialist India, the India of our courageous workers and peasants.

Pio was a bridge between India and Africa. Pio, by his every act, demonstrated the oneness of the anti-imperialist battle, the solidarity of Asia and Africa, of India and Africa.

* * *

I am proud that I knew Pio, that I had shaken his hand, that I had sat and listened to him, talked to him, for hours and hours at a time. . . .

Uncompromising Fighter

President Kenyatta has paid Pinto the finest tributes that can be paid to any man. And in his statement of homage to the memory of this son of Kenya, the President has referred to the years Pio suffered in prison 'for his uncompromising line in politics'.

It is indeed this that impressed one most about Pio. And the impression grew with every meeting.

It was in India that I met Pio first. Those were the days of the intensification of the Goan freedom struggle, and I was one of the secretaries of the National Campaign Committee for the Liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu. Pio was here twice during that period if I remember correctly.

How impatient he was for the liberation of his beloved Goa. And I have little doubt that his inspiring words and pledges roused the Goan freedom fighters to regroup themselves, and give that last magnificent push, which compelled the Government of India to act.

The last time I met Pio was in Nairobi, in his own Kenya, in 1963. I had gone as a member of the Indian delegation to the Third Afro Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference in Moshi (Tanganyika), and we passed through Nairobi on our way to and from Moshi.

Pio was there to greet our delegation when we arrived. He was there to see us off. And in between he was with us, to help us meet the leaders of Kenya, to understand the situation there, the problems, the hopes and aspirations.

Pio was himself part of the Kenya group which attended the Moshi conference, under the leadership of that resolute African patriot Oginga Odinga.

Every time we talked, Pio spoke of the need for solidarity against the imperialists.

Yes, he would say, we are marching forward, more and more countries are becoming independent, but be vigilant, for the imperialists have not yet been liquidated—they are here, striving to come back, to divide us.

Assault on Neo-Colonialism

I know that it was he who was amongst the first in Kenya to launch a fullscale assault on the dangers of neo-colonialism. Not for him the ending of struggle with the ringing of the bells of independence. Not for him any sitting back in his chair, after he became an M.P.

Always a powerful journalist, he organised the KANU press. He brought out a militant journal titled *Pan Africa* and organised the progressive *Pan Africa* Publishers. As throughout his life, now too there was no compromise. The fight went on. No abandonment of principles, no weakening of resolve.

* * *

And precisely because of this tireless exposure of imperialism, this passionate crusade against neo-colonialism—the imperialists killed Pio Pinto. They shot him dead at point blank range near his home. The cowards who killed, fired in the dark and then ran away.

But Pio's indomitable spirit lives. It lives in the work of the many brave young Africans, who had been inspired by his work, by the enthusiasm for the building of a socialist Africa which he always had.

Pio lives too in the mighty movement of Afro-Asian solidarity, which grows with every day.

(From *New Age,* Delhi)

SOUTH WEST AFRICA—THE HOUR OF DECISION

Sol Dubula

AFTER 19 YEARS of evasion and defiance, South Africa's white state enters the last phase of the battle to defend its robbery of the territory of South West Africa. Towards the middle of this year the International Court of Justice at the Hague is expected to deliver judgement on the claim by Ethiopia and Liberia that South Africa is in breach of the letter and spirit of the League of Nations' mandate in terms of which she was first given certain administrative powers over the territory. (It is a commentary on the primitive state of international relations after the first world war that South Africa's racial government should have been nominated as the custodian of a 'sacred trust' with the injunction to 'promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the indigenous inhabitants').

The International Tribunal is asked to hold that the application to South West Africa of the latest variant of white domination—apartheid—constitutes a violation of the original mandate because, amongst other things, in the words of the applicants

> in sum under apartheid the accident of birth imposes a mandatory life sentence to discrimination, repression and humiliation

and the application of territorial apartheid is

> unsound, inhuman and incompatible with the obligations of the mandate.

It is also the contention of the applicants that illegally, without the consent of the United Nations and in a way which is inconsistent with the international character of the territory, South Africa has altered its status (a euphemism for blatant colonisation).

Up to now, aided and abetted by its imperialist allies, South Africa has, year after year, succeeded in staving off world action on its barbaric treatment of the indigenous African people who form an overwhelming majority of the population of South Africa and South West Africa. Not only has it turned a deaf ear to the numerous appeals for a modification of its race policies but, encouraged by world inaction, it has become bolder and bolder. As in South Africa, so in South West Africa, Dr. Verwoerd has proceeded with a steadily growing confidence that United Nation's anger would not find concrete expression because of sabotage by South Africa's powerful allies.

To add insult to injury the Nazi-inspired racialists speak of the United Nations in terms which in themselves are sufficient to make them unfit to be part of a civilised world community of nations. Speaking on an attempt by the United Nations to achieve some sort of supervision over South West Africa, Eric Louw who until his recent retirement was Verwoerd's Foreign Minister and many times his emissary to the United Nations Organization, said

> It (the United Nations) consists of predominantly coloured and asiatic countries and of countries whose inhabitants are of mixed blood . . . a large number of South American and Central American peoples are predominantly of mixed blood. . . . The U.N. should be afforded no opportunity, by the submission of reports, to interfere with our affairs or discuss our administration of South West Africa.

They hurl this type of race insult and spit defiance and contempt at world opinion because up to now they have been pretty well assured that when the dust of debate settles those who claim to be the citadels of the 'free world' will ensure that the enslavement of South West Africa is left undisturbed. The reason for this is plain. The last report of the United Nations Special Committee on Colonialism (October 1964) which examines the activities of mining and other international companies with interests in South West Africa, concludes:

> Foreign capital holds a dominant position in the economy of South West Africa and the main sectors of production are controlled by foreign enterprises or by settlers of European descent who are mainly from the Republic of South Africa. It has concentrated on the development of highly profitable primary export industries namely mining, fishing and karakul farming which exploit the territory's rich resources. . . .
>
> The foreign companies operating in South West Africa have no interest in developing any sort of balanced economy in the territory . . . the African inhabitants live at a barely subsistence level.
>
> The desire of the South African government to annex South West Africa is directly connected with the activities of international companies which are interested in keeping the territory as a field for the investment of the capital, a source of raw material and cheap labour. . . .
>
> The discriminatory laws of South West Africa in respect of mining and labour are designed to exclude the Africans from any direct participation in the mining industry and to guarantee the industry a permanent supply of cheap, unskilled migrant labour. . . .
>
> The policy of apartheid which is being carried out in South West Africa by the South African racist regime offers the foreign companies every opportunity for the exploitation of the indigenous inhabitants. In fact the exploitation of low-paid non-European workers is a feature of the territory's economic system, especially in

> its mining industry and agriculture. This enables the foreign companies and the local European farmers to reap high profits and makes any improvement in the living conditions of the Africans impossible.
>
> The work which the Africans perform for mining and other companies is basically forced labour and therefore the African population lives as though in slavery. . . .
>
> The fact that the greater part of the territory's economic production is in the hands of foreign enterprises, has serious implications not only for the territory's economy but also in the political and social fields. . . . In the ultimate analysis it can be shown that the overwhelming majority of the mining companies belong to a complex of foreign capital which operates in many areas of Southern Africa, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, the Congo (Leopoldville) and Angola and in reality is directed by a number of monopolistic combines controlled by financial interests in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa. As a result of this an overwhelming proportion of the profits obtained in the territory goes to the above-mentioned countries and also to other countries which invest their capital in South West Africa. . . .
>
> **Foreign companies operating in South West Africa, motivated by high profits rather than the development of the territory and its people, share South Africa's interest in perpetuating the existing system of administration as long as possible. It is precisely from those member states with financial interests in the territory that the Republic of South Africa derives its main support in the United Nations and outside which encourages its continued non-compliance with the Charter and the numerous resolutions of the United Nations concerning the question of South West Africa.**

It remains to be seen whether if, as is to be expected, the International Court's judgement goes against South Africa, these same powerful financial interests will once again wield sufficient influence and strength to stand in the way of United Nations action. Already there is a hint of another betrayal. *The Times* (London) with traditional insincere pomposity recently expressed doubt whether the enforcement of a judgement against South Africa on the South West African issue would not risk 'developments out of all proportion to the dispute.' The excellent documentation which is contained in the report of the Special Committee in support of its conclusions will leave no one in doubt that the chief risk which *The Times* has in mind is the risk of bringing about a position in which South West Africa is no longer open house for financial plunder.

One thing is crystal clear. What the United Nations Organisation does on the question of South West Africa after the judgement is delivered has implications which extend beyond this territory. If, after almost 20 years of the most patient pleading and armed with the imposing sanction of the International Court, the United Nations Organisation is once again rendered impotent because of the manoeuvres of imperialist financial interests, there exists a crisis of the first magnitude. This crisis must by its very nature threaten the whole future of the international body itself. Can there be any doubt that anything short of effective concrete measures to enforce such a judgement will make a mockery of international law and of the United Nations Organisation as an instrument against international banditry.

Reports from South West Africa suggest that there still exists a touching faith by the South West African people that they will not, once again, be betrayed by those who have the obligation to exercise authority and power in the interests of a defenceless colonial people. The tragic history of these people who have been conquered, decimated and used as an object of international horse-trading between the big powers, is filled with much struggle, much expectation and much betrayal. It also abounds with examples of heroism and great deeds by South West Africa's political and military leaders.

THE GERMAN OCCUPATION

The process of colonisation in South West Africa followed the same pattern as in most other colonial territories. 'The missionary and the trader must precede the soldier', said Bismarck. And long before any colonial power started its official plunder under the guise of 'protection', the advance parties of various religious orders infiltrated into the territory. Trading concessions were obtained and by a judicious blending of religion and commerce the members of the German Rhenish Mission Society soon came to occupy a position of influence in the territory. Inevitably the territory was to fall prey to a more direct form of imperialist domination. For this was the period when our Continent was treated as a carcass to be sliced up after the hunt. Despite a period of manoeuvring and gentlemanly back-stabbing amongst the hunters, Britain, with a typical self-assumed power to take or to grant what was not hers, gave her blessings (and God's blessing) to the German plunder of South West Africa. Gladstone, on finding that Germany's gun-boat had berthed before Britain's was sporting enough to say:

> If Germany is to become a colonising power, all I can say is, God speed her. She becomes our ally and partner in the execution of the great purposes of Providence for the advantage of mankind.

And the German colonising machine did not waste much time in executing the purposes of 'Providence'. In some cases by treachery and deceit, treaties of protection were extorted from the scattered and divided chiefs. In other cases brute force was the weapon.

When the true history of South West Africa is taught the sagacity, patriotism and generalship of Hendrik Witbooi the Nama chief, will rank him amongst the greatest of the early liberation fighters in Africa. To Chief Maharero who entered into a treaty with the Germans he said: 'You will have bitter eternal remorse for this handing of your land and sovereignty over to the hands of the white people. This giving of yourself into the hands of the white people will become to you a burden as if you were carrying the sun on your back'.

The refusal by Witbooi to accept the burden of 'protection' was the signal for a surprise attack on his stronghold. With the cry from Witbooi 'I will never surrender my independence,' the Nama people fought back until the unequal balance of military strength forced them to surrender. Other risings by smaller groups were also drowned in blood.

By 1903 more than half the cattle of the Herero had passed into German hands and the familiar process of 'liberating' the African from his land and passing it over to the White settler had begun. Such was the extent of the plunder that even Samuel Maharero, an unwanted nominee of the German administration, who succeeded the builder of the Herero nation, Maharero, was driven to defiance and a new war of resistance began in 1904. With 7,000 fighting men only a third of whom were armed with primitive and outmoded rifles, the rebellion challenged German rule for almost a year. But the arrival of government reinforcements and the superior might of the colonialists' arms once again ended a heroic stand. What followed was one of the most horrific operations ever carried out even in a Continent which abounds in examples of acts of inhumanity and barbarism committed in the name of God and Providence.

General von Trotha threw a cordon across every possible escape route and issued his notorious Extermination Order (*Vernichtungs Befehl*). This required the killing of every Herero man, woman and child within the belligerent area of the north.

Once again Hendrik Witbooi rallied all the tribes in the south and started a guerilla struggle that was to last 3 years. Witbooi was himself killed in action after a year and his place was taken by Jacob Marengo. By 1907 the resistance was crushed. By then half of the Nama population had perished and the Herero had been reduced from a cattle rich population of 80,000 to 15,000 impoverished land-hungry fugitives in the country of their fathers.

UNDER SOUTH AFRICAN RULE

The defeat of their cruel conquerors during the first world war awakened new hopes in the heart of the decimated people of South West Africa. They were to be quickly disillusioned. An offer to help fight the Germans was met with a response from the South African Commander in Chief that this was a 'white man's war' and he didn't want any coloured participation on any side. When the war ended South Africa was awarded South West Africa as a mandate. Even at that early stage outright annexation was difficult to sanction in the light of what was known of South Africa's race policies.

The war had hardly ended when, in a joint military operation, between South African forces and Portuguese colonialists in Angola, the rebellion of heroic 21 year old Chief Mandume standing at the head of the Ukuanyama, the second largest tribe in Ovamboland, was drowned in blood. In all over 5,000 Africans had been killed in the battles first against the Portuguese and then against the South Africans.

A few years later the return from exile of Abraham Morris, a leader of the Bondelswarts in the second Nama war against the Germans, was made the occasion for another massacre of horrifying dimensions. When the people refused to hand Morris over to the authorities, they were told 'The lead of the government will now melt upon you.' This promise was fulfilled. This time the conqueror was helped by his aeroplanes which rained bombs on the people.

The question of who was boss having been settled the South African administration proceeded to transform its newly acquired territory to conform to its own traditional pattern of race rule. The influx of new white settlers was encouraged by the allocation of large and rich land holdings. In 1913 the white population of the territory was 14,830. Whites owned 11,490,000 hectares. By 1962 the white population was over 72,000 and whites owned 5,800 farms the areas of which totalled about 40 million hectares. In the same year the non-white population of half a million owned 21,825,497 hectares.

The familiar process of squeezing the African population into "natural homelands" to make room for white expansion proceeded apace. When asked by the Trusteeship Council in 1948 why the Herero had been split into 8 separated reserves and why their land had never been returned to them, the South African government stated that its efforts to resettle the Herero was limited by the extent to which land alienation had 'in the meantime' taken place.

The position is well summarised in *South West Africa* by Ruth First.

> It was not a shortage of land that restricted African occupation but a matter of policy, the traditional South African policy of rigid race rule. Throughout the history of its control over South West Africa, the South African government has always found enough land—and the best land—for white farmers, and never enough for the African tribes. Only the code of white supremacy can account for the double entries in the books of the administration. In 1922 it was an 'utter impossibility' to restore the tribes to their former lands. In 1928 the administration had huge areas at its disposal for the settlement of the Angola boers. . . . Segregation policies initiated in the first years of the mandate entrenched for all the future of South Africa's administration a system of white privilege and non-white subjection in every sphere of life.

Over 75 years ago the Herero chiefs, with rare insight, foresaw this and stated in a public document: 'We have learnt with deep concern that a very extensive gathering of Dutch farmers has arrived . . . to settle. . . . They intend to make war on us and compel us to submit. . . . We have no unoccupied land for the admission of any other nation, more especially one who, we have been led to believe, has always looked upon the black tribes with scorn and indignation and who both recognise and practise slavery.'

Their fears were well founded and the prophecy was fulfilled. Its very fulfilment is now used as a basis for the perpetration of further historical outrages. This is how it works. First, by conquest followed up by alien rule a people is deprived of all political rights and of their land heritage. It is dispersed into artificially created reservations. It is prevented from participating in the ownership of the minerals and other riches of its own country. These acts of banditry then become the basis and the 'justification' for yet another act of plunder—the final fragmentation of a nation and the creation of ethnic labour ghettoes which the white supremacists call Bantustans.

Last year's infamous Odendaal Commission report incorporated this morally indefensible approach. It proposed the partitioning of South West Africa into 10 separate 'homelands' for non-whites covering an aggregate area of 32,629,394 hectares of the territory's 82,388,000 hectares. The bulk of the land will become the preserve of the white minority settlers or the white South African government. An analysis of the provisions relating to the administrative powers of the future 'governments' of these homelands, leaves no doubt that they will be under the perpetual domination of the South African state. If any additional evidence were needed to substantiate this fear, an examination of the show-piece of apartheid—the Transkei Bantustan—disposes of the question.

For the moment Verwoerd has been forced by international pressure to suspend implementation of the Odendaal apartheid scheme pending the outcome of the International Court's decision. If it is left to the South African white state there can be no doubt that, whatever detailed scheme is finally implemented, the real source of weath and power will remain out of the reach of the indigenous population. It surprises no one that in the so-called natural homelands of the S.W.A. people there is no industry, no working mine and no viable economic structure. In 1961 two companies, the Tsumeb Corporation Ltd. and the Consolidated Diamond Mines Ltd. of South West Africa between them controlled the extraction of 94 per cent of the territory's useful minerals. These companies are controlled by a group of South African, English and American financial oligarchs. They will go all out to prevent any interference with Verwoerd's schemes because they know that apartheid is amongst the most effective modern devices for the economic exploitation of an indigenous people. A British businessman quoted in the magazine *Time* (December 21st, 1962) said: 'If it weren't for apartheid—never mind whether we like it or not—we would not think of investing there'.

In defence of its barbaric treatment of non-white people in the Republic the South African government has with monotonous regularity attempted to put up a case that the issue was a 'domestic' one. In the early days she was supported in this contention by her imperialist friends. In time even the latter could no longer pretend that what was going on in South Africa should not be subjected to international scrutiny. How much more force then is there in the contention that South Africa's treatment of a people in respect of whom it is supposed to be exercising an international trust, must conform to civilized standards and is the business of all mankind. It it is held that such administration does not conform to civilized standards there can be no legitimate reason for any failure on the part of the United Nations to act in order to enforce its will.

The main responsibility for ensuring that there is not another betrayal by the United Nations Organisation lies with the Afro-Asian states and the socialist world. If on an issue such as this which goes to the very root of international law, the imperialists get away with it, they will get away with anything. Let us not underestimate our strength. The double game which the imperialists have been able to play on the South African question has been made easy by the fact that up to now they have managed to have the best of both worlds—profiting out of apartheid and having cordial relations with many newly emergent nations. The time has come when they must be made to feel that this sort of duplicity will no longer be tolerated.

NIGERIA

AFTER THE ELECTIONS

A Special Correspondent

NIGERIA is passing through very difficult times—times which, as President Azikiwe has said, 'try men's souls'. The first-ever general elections to be held in the Republic since Nigeria wrenched herself free from British colonial tutelage on October 1, 1960, ended in a fiasco. Leading Nigerian politicians, amongst whom was the Premier of Eastern Nigeria and leader of the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens (N.C.N.C.), Dr. Michael Okpara, said the December 30th elections were a huge farce. Others were of the opinion that the general conduct of the elections was a gigantic fraud. Dr. Tunji Otegbeye, Secretary-General of the left-wing Socialist Workers and Farmers Party (S.W.A.F.P.), described the polls as a muddle. Prime Minister Alhaji Abubaka Tafawa Balewa, deputy leader of the Northern People's Congress (N.P.C.), while not denying that irregularities existed in the manner of the December polls advised that complaints should be directed to the law courts for redress.

The majority of Nigeria's politicians and statesmen are afraid to admit that the present impasse in which Nigeria is enthralled is not just a political crisis over the health of the last elections. The simple truth is that Nigeria is drifting towards revolution. Though the fires of political agitation which marked the election may have diminished it is far from true that the crisis is over, nor has the swearing in of Alhaji Abubaka's 'broadly based national government' really resolved the crisis.

The evasiveness with which the Southern Nigeria-based Progressive Grand Alliance tolerated the six-point Azikiwe-Balewa compromise pact 'ending the crisis' is indicative of deep uneasiness. The alliance while doubting the constitutional legality of Alhaji Abubaka government, would give it 'a fair triai'. One wonders how practicable that is.

What one sees in the present apparent calm is a lull between storms. The first storms wrecked the elections. They created an atmosphere of political intolerance and acrimony. How did it all begin?

Fleeing British colonialists bequeathed to Nigeria a capitalist economy tailored to the interest of foreign businessmen and their local agents. A feudal economic administration was imposed on the capitalist foundation. During four years of Nigeria's independence this control constricted the national economy. The structure which lacked purpose and firm direction, led to serious contradictions of a socio-economic nature and resulted in stagnation. By December 8th, 1964, when President Azikiwe dissolved the 312-member House of Representatives for fresh elections, a correlation of political forces had taken place out of which emerged two broad fronts. Each presented a programme on how best to arrest further deterioration in the national economy.

A rightist trend of feudal conservatism was represented by the Northern People's Congress, a party of feudal aristocrats of Northern Nigeria. The N.P.C. together with the compradore bourgeois party of Western Nigeria (Nigerian National Democratic Party) teamed up in the inappropriately named Nigerian National Alliance.

Opposed in theory, if not in practice, to this right-wing reaction, were the national bourgeois parties—the N.C.N.C. and the Action Group. Though dreading a genuine left movement, they advanced certain socialist slogans and united their forces. Their unity gave birth to the Progressive Grand Alliance (U.P.G.A.). The progressive character of the U.P.G.A. was illustrated by the inclusion within it of the anti-feudal forces of Northern Nigeria—the Northern Progressive Front.

A third line of action was represented by the Socialist Workers and Farmers Party (a Marxist-Leninist Party) supported by the progressive trade unions. The S.W.A.F.P. advocated a unity of all progressive parties as a sure step forward in the march against feudalism—feudalism which had proved the greatest obstacle to any progress in Nigeria. Drawing lessons from its analysis of the nature of Nigerian feudalism and class struggle, the S.W.A.F.P. contended that so long as the feudalists controlled the Federal Government, Nigeria's independence will be more fictional than real. It called for a united democratic front. In the absence of such a front, the party pledged to co-operate with the U.P.G.A. to make it impossible for the feudalists to retain power by constitutional methods, by fair and free elections.

ANTI-FEUDAL UPSURGE

But in a Nigeria where the feudalists have in actual practice succeeded in placing themselves in positions where at their capricious pleasure they have bent the will of the nation to their own, it was illusory to expect fair and free elections. The abnormal structure of the Nigerian federation left about two-thirds of the entire area in the feudal stronghold of the north, where over 50 per cent of all parliamentary seats are located (167 out of 312) and loads the electoral system in favour of the feudalists. But even so, events in the last days of Parliament had shaken the faith of the Northern rulers that they could jockey themselves back to power through free elections.

Strategists of the N.P.C. had counted for victory on the inability of the progressive forces to present a united front at the polls. In this they were frustrated by the formation of the U.P.G.A. and the sincere pledge of the S.W.A.F.P. to work in amity with the alliance based on principles and substance. Things were really moving badly for the turbaned horsemen of the north. The repression of the Tivs (a minority Christian community of 1.5 million) by the Northern Nigeria Government a few weeks before the election drove a wedge between the feudalists and a significant sector of the electorate. Never before in Nigeria's political history had the feudalists been so unpopular with the masses as during the election period last year. And never before had the anti-feudal forces exhibited such mature understanding and a determined willingness to co-operate. The banishment of the Emir of Kano, Alhaji Sanusi, one of the most influential rulers in the Moslem North, by the Northern Nigeria Government boomeranged against the feudalists. The passage of a law by that Regional Government which empowers it to banish or exile emirs without giving reason, further discredited the feudalists.

The history of the N.P.C. and its election victories is the history of the moral and practical support of the emirs to that party. In the December 1959 general elections the powers of the emirs were at their zenith. The politically unconscious masses of the North adored the emirs and the progressive parties were divided and antagonistic to one another. Even then the N.P.C. failed to secure a majority. Though the party won 134 of the 167 seats in the North, the state of the parties in Parliament was N.P.C. 134; N.C.N.C. and allies 89; Action Group and allies 75. From the figures it is evident that without the support given by the then Azikiwe-led N.C.N.C. (now in the U.P.G.A.) to the feudalists in forming the Federal Coalition Government, the position of the feudalists in Nigeria today would have been different. Nigerians would have been better off, and imperialism and neo-colonialism would have been worse off.

FEUDAL TERRORISM AND ORGANIZED GANGSTERISM

The feudalists, desperate at having lost their ally (N.C.N.C.) to the progressives, took to violence as the last chance. The actions of the N.P.C-led Nigerian National Alliance (N.N.A.) betrayed its leadership's loss of faith in democratic elections. That party organized terrorists who murdered candidates of the progressive parties in cold blood. In Sokoto Province (nerve-centre of N.P.C. influence), four candidates of the grand alliance were killed. Armed gangs on the pay sheet of the N.N.A. kidnapped candidates of the progressive parties. These and other criminal methods of intimidation forced some candidates of the progressive parties to flee to safety. Under these tragic circumstances, seventy candidates of the Northern People's Congress were returned 'unopposed' in the Northern Region at the close of nominations on December 19th. Prime Minister Alhaji Abubaka was returned 'unopposed' in his Bauchi consituency. The law enforcement sector of the Northern Nigeria Government actively connived in the crimes as shown by sworn affidavits. 'Native Authority' policemen arbitrarily arrested thousands of supporters of the progressive parties. The 'Native Court' judges (alkalis) sentenced the accused to heavy terms of imprisonment in the fashion of the inquisition. Charges ranged from 'taking part in unlawful assemblies'—political party rallies—to using 'insulting language' against feudal aristocrats. Alli Abdali, U.P.G.A. candidate in Kano Province, was jailed for twelve months on a charge that he insulted the leader of the N.P.C. and Sardauna of Sokoto, Alhaji Ahmadu Bello. The Federal Nigerian police were passive in the face of such atrocities.

Reflecting on the situation in Northern Nigeria, President Azikiwe wrote in a planned broadcast to the nation on January 1st. 'The evidence before me shows that there were refusals of permit for peaceful assembly in a supposedly free and fair election; road blocks were mounted and trenches dug to prevent entry of political opponents into towns.

'There were mass arrests of political opponents; many political opponents have been imprisoned and several others killed; political opponents have been prevented from filling nomination papers.'

THE BOYCOTT—A FAR-SIGHTED DECISION

Under the circumstances, only one peaceful course of action was open to the progressive parties—a total boycott of the polls. This the U.P.G.A. and the S.W.A.F.P. did and resolved not to recognize any government sworn in on the basis of the rigged elections. In the face of the effective boycott the feudalist-led N.N.A. announced that it had won a land-slide victory. Figures later revealed that some of the 'victorious' candidates polled not more than 600 votes in constituencies where there were over 70,000 registered voters. The majority of voters stayed away from the polls in obedience to the boycott call.

The boycott has been criticized in certain political quarters as being a mistake. Far from being an error of judgment, it was a far-sighted decision. Two courses of action were open to the progressive parties in the situation of criminal terrorism. One was to answer violence with violence. Millions would have been drowned in blood and the stability of the Federation would have been dangerously upset. The feudalists had looked forward to a situation of violence in which they would have felt justified in calling for the aid of British troops. The support given by the out-going Nigerian Government to U.S.-Belgian aggression in the Congo in November last year, is a pointer to what that Government can do in a condition of sporadic and ill-organized anti-feudal uprisings and general unrest in the Republic. The feudalists had also seen in any ensuing chaos a rare opportunity for them to liquidate the progressives in the country by abuse of the State apparatus. The Cabinet Ministers in charge of the armed forces and security organs, including the Prime Minister, were all members of the Northern People's Congress. By the election boycott the treacherous plans of the feudalists were exposed and wrecked without a shot being fired.

The boycott was a defeat for British imperialism and its local agents, at a time when the progressive front has not prepared the necessary groundwork to fight back against the foreign-backed feudalists by confronting violence with violence. A line of action based on violence is out of the question at the present stage unless the masses become class conscious and organized, become trained and educated in class struggle against, for the present, the entire Nigerian feudal régime of the putrid autocracy. Even the present leadership (with some exceptions), has yet much to learn in the art, tactics and methods of combat against Nigeria's bastard feudal system. Hence the necessity for a united democratic anti-feudal front. The realization of this bitter fact in no small measure determined the attitude of the progressive parties to the savage assaults against them by vandals of the N.N.A. The mature judgment of the U.P.G.A. and S.W.A.F.P. prevented a 'Katanga' in Nigeria. British imperialism has really lost.

Boycott of the elections was a peaceful assault which made nonsense of the polls in fact if not in law. It created serious doubts in political quarters in and outside Nigeria as to the moral standards and political integrity of those Nigerians who will assume office on the basis of these elections. In this also the progressives won. The moral impact created by the boycott was stated by President Azikiwe, 'The issues involved in this crisis,' he said, 'are essentially moral. If those who won the federal elections under the tragic circumstances we have recently experienced insisted on applying the letter of the law, then in my humble opinion [in the opinion I would add, of the great majority of Nigerians and mankind in general] it would be a Pyrrhic victory.'

The boycott has thus laid the foundation for successful resistance against the feudalists. President Azikiwe, reflecting on what may lie ahead if a government took office under those circumstances recalled the words and thoughts of late U.S. President Woodrow Wilson:

> 'We should then realize that victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently but as upon quicksand.'

Having won the moral contest, the progressives have moved into the legal battle.

'NATIONAL' GOVERNMENT

On January 4th, President Azikiwe called on Alhaji Abubaka to form a Government not many hours after he (President Azikiwe) had stated he would rather resign than swear in a Government on the results of the December 30th elections.

> 'I find it extremely awkward to exercise the power to call upon any person to form a government. True the constitution is clear on this issue but my decision is that I will not exercise such a power and I would rather resign. This should release my conscience from the chains of power politics.'

It is not yet clear whether President Azikiwe swore in the Balewa Government only on the basis of the election results or on a vague mutual undertaking by Alhaji Abubaka that he would form a 'broadly based national government'. No matter on what terms the Government took office, one thing is certain—the feudalists are back again in the saddle. And with it a stepping up of the anti-feudal campaign in new dimensions and in different forms.

The progressives are faced with a decision whether or not to participate in the new Government. Much will depend on what Prime Minister Alhaji Abubaka would regard as a 'broadly based national government'. Already, he has put out the wrong foot first. He has appointed three new ministers from his party, thereby giving the Cabinet a 'one-party' appearance.

At this stage it must be observed that all is not well within the U.P.G.A. A war of nerves is raging between the middle class and upper strata bourgeoisie. While the progressive intellectuals backed by the youth, the students, the rank and file, advocate that participation should be guided by 'no sacrifice of principles', the upper segments crave for government office on any terms, including capitulation to the feudalists. They strive to create situations which will enable them to strike a huckster's bargain with the feudalists. This bourgeoisie, owing to their class position are incapable of waging a decisive struggle against feudalism. They are too heavily fettered by private property, capital and land to enter into any decisive struggle. They strive to come to terms with feudal autocracy rather than crush it. They are too much in need of feudalism with its medieval 'native' administration, police and thugs for use ultimately against the workers and peasants, to be able to strive for its destruction. But the progressives are not deceived. They entertain no illusions on this score. They know the treacherous nature of the bourgeoisie.

Every action and statement from the leadership of the Northern People's Congress before and after the December polls indicates that the feudalists are hardly interested in a national government in which the progressives will play any part of importance. Their seeming preparedness to have a 'national government' is a ruse calculated to give the new Government an appearance of legality and a sense of moral security. They plan to include some anti-feudal ministers just to place the Government on a firmer footing, reduce the mounting opposition from the progressive masses and then turn around when firmly established to give the progressives the boot. Whatever is done by the progressive forces should be looked upon as a stage in the continuation of the anti-feudal struggle. Parliament should be utilized to sharpen class contraditions, expose feudal reaction and arouse the public against neo-colonialists, in order to prepare the masses for the inevitable all-out anti-feudal campaign. If it does not contribute to this aim, any decision to join hands with the feudalists in the Balewa Cabinet would prove a tragic error. This is a more likely outcome. And reasons are not difficult to find.

With the feudalists in power, and with a Parliament in which they would readily secure a two-thirds majority, experience points to what will top the priority list of legislation. (*a*) Further curtailment of individual liberty and freedom, and (*b*) Further inroads into the independence of the judiciary, reducing it to a pawn of reactionary politicians. At present appointment to the bench is on the recommendation of political executives. Even the office of Solicitor-General has been brought under the whims and caprices of the Minister of Justice and the Attorney-General, who is a politician. All these proposals are aimed at suppressing the progressive elements and stemming the anti-feudal tide. How far Nigeria is from being a dictatorship is anybody's guess, but it is a dictatorship that is digging its own grave.

What Nigeria needs at this stage is a provisional government in which a broad sector of the political and social life of the nation will be democratically represented. The main task of the provisional government will be to take measures to lessen the present political tension, keep the State machinery working and prepare the nation for free and fair elections. Such a government will be purely transitional and will have a normal life span of six months.

The terms of the Azikiwe-Balewa pact may lure the grand alliance to a surrender of the well-begun campaign against feudalism, and come to terms with the feudalists. The terms of the agreement include a reaffirmation of belief in the unity of the Federation 'in which every citizen shall have equal opportunity and no one shall be oppressed; a strict observance of the constitution until it is amended according to law and wish of the people; and a review of the Nigerian Constitution and dissolution of the Western House of Assembly to enable the people to express their will as to who should govern them.

It is sheer fantasy for any sincere Nigerian citizen to think that equal opportunity for all' could exist under the present régime. It is impossible. The feudalists are bent on protecting their class interest as opposed to the interest of the common people whose class is historically antagonistic to theirs. Every action of the Government, the State apparatus, is directed towards class oppression. How can equal opportunity exist for all in a society where abject poverty for the masses is the rule rather than the exception; where a bunch of cut-throats have climbed on the bones of the masses to heights of mammon wealth; where the gap between the 'haves' and the 'have nots' yawns wider each second of the day; where imperialism and neo-colonialism have found reliable allies in the feudal rulers. This is the root cause of all Nigerian ailments. The poverty-drenched masses cannot peacefully coexist with feudalism, they cannot compromise with the enemies of liberty and independence. The masses are pitching battle against the accursed heritage of serfdom and human degradation.

SECESSION IS NO ANSWER

Some are seeking a solution in breaking up the Nigerian Federation by some areas seceding. This is hardly an answer.

No one region of Nigeria could hope to benefit immediately after a secession, no matter how peacefully the sharing was conducted. The regions have for decades been interdependent, revolving on a federal axis. Secession will steer the regions on a collision course. Secession will bring about economic problems for each region which if not retarding the development of that part will surely halt its progress for a long time to come. Hitherto neglected problems will assume colossal proportions. Yet unknown ones will arise. These are many and diverse. They demand various, not-easy-to-find prescriptions and cures. The broad masses, the generality, unprivileged and under-privileged Nigerians, tens of millions of them, will be worse off. Only a few politicians stand to gain. Their selfishly motivated actions will ignite inflammable situations, the tragedy of which they would hardly escape.

Secession would mean an abandonment of progressive elements in the north. The revolutionary Tivs would be the first victims. They have continued to exist and to have warded off encroachment on their liberty only because of the surveillance of the Federal Coalition Government. The Tivs have consistently identified themselves with progressive anti-feudal fronts. If the north or any part of the south secedes, then the fate of the minority Tivs would be sealed. A seceded Northern Nigeria could maintain stability only by ruthless crushing of the opposition. The ruling Northern People's Congress likens in thought and in deed parliamentary opposition to an unwanted luxury —a luxury which they say is alien and contrary to the tenets of Islam and the Fulani mode of administration. Every measure of that Government is aimed at removing the last vestiges of opposition. That party and the Government it runs move steadily towards a despotism. It would be a betrayal if the teeming millions of Northern Nigeria peasantry swamped in illiteracy and enslaved by a medieval feudal system, the peasantry which continually looks southwards for salvation, should be left all alone at the mercy of their slave masters. It would be unpardonable for the southern politicians if they should retire to the south leaving the fate of the opposition parties in the north to the jackals of the north, in a fragmented Nigeria. This situation can be brought about by the secession of any part of the country, more especially the south. Let us examine the various regions.

Eastern Nigeria is the most politically stable region in the Federation, though dissatisfaction with the state of affairs is increasing. Eastern Nigeria has a strident minority problem. The confidence of the minority groups in the Government of that region has continually been bolstered and nurtured by the protection which the Federal Nigeria Government promises and offers them. Secede Eastern Nigeria from the Federation, then the minority people will seek other measures of protection. The situation might get explosive and proportionately dangerous. These minority groups have made no secret of their determination to have a separate State of their own—free from the intrusions of Ibo domination real or imaginary. (The Ibos are the majority tribe in the east.)

The political situation in *Western Nigeria* at present is chaotic enough; secession would increase the chaos. For three years the Western Region and her 10 million people have experienced a chain of political crises which are far from over, and which have caused economic setbacks. The present Government can claim popular support only with very serious reservations. Not until after fresh fair and free elections have been held to the Western Nigeria Legislature can any government there establish an order which will be constitutionally backed, legally upheld and morally supported; the present Government came into being after a putsch early in 1964. Western Nigeria has since the emergency of 1962 relied on the Federal Coalition Government for financial aid. One cannot overlook the danger that a seceded Western Nigeria might seek aid elsewhere and, hard pressed, auction her independence to a willing bidder. Such a situation would endanger the security of the neighbouring Regions or States.

Mid-Western Nigeria, where an oil boom had raised the hopes of politicians, is politically inexperienced This is the youngest Region of the Federation, and depends on Federal Government aid in no small measure. With a population of 2 million inhabitants the region has the greatest number of clan-conscious groups with strong tribal loyalties. The unifying force has been the Federal Nigeria Constitution. If the Mid-West Region secedes, she could find herself torn apart by warring clan factions.

In a dismembered Nigeria the future of the federal capital, Lagos, would be in dispute. Western Nigeria may revive her claim over Lagos, for access to Lagos from most parts of the Federation is through Western Nigeria territory or air space. From the east, Lagos is accessible via the Atlantic Ocean, by-passing Western Nigeria territory, but Eastern Nigerians are far from being sea-farers.

All in all, it is evident that a quest for secession of any part of the Federation is mad adventurism. The proposal for secession marks the utter hopelessness and despair of the southern bourgeois politicians who, having lost hope for the overthrow of the feudal régime in the north, have become terrified of a predicted feudal take-over of what is still left them in the south. These southern politicians who exhibit such glaring cowardice have completely severed ties with historical reality and the immutable laws governing the development of society.

Nigeria shall stride along bravely. Her millions of workers and peasants shall march in unity to the eternal goal—socialism. Feudalism shall be trampled underfoot. Imperialism shall succumb before the assault of the awakening revolutionaries. Led by the party of the proletariat (Socialist Workers and Farmers Party), in unison with the progressive trade unions, backed by the progressive intellectuals in a united national democratic front, the Nigerian people shall win their revolution—a vital revolution sweeping our giant continent —Africa!

ASPECTS OF THE INDIAN SCENE

Mohit Sen

The author, a member of the Andhra State Council and of the Central Research Department of the Communist Party of India, has written this article specially for the AFRICAN COMMUNIST.

THE INDIAN SCENE TODAY is dominated by clash and conflict, but not as yet by a definite polarization of forces. The death of Pandit Nehru almost a year ago has heightened the sense of contradiction and of drift in the policies and cohesion of the ruling Congress Party. But no viable progressive alternative has yet emerged—the national democratic front has yet to be built.

India had the advantage and the curse of being one of the relatively more capitalistically developed of the colonial countries. While this gave it a better industrial base to begin with at the dawn of freedom in 1947 than almost any other ex-colonial country, a fairly large intelligentsia and a certain measure of capitalist development in the countryside, it also meant that the strength of the capitalist class—its economic base and its ideological-political influence—was stronger, presenting obstacles to the jump to the next stage of national-democratic, non-capitalist development.

True, the working class was also numerically larger than in other ex-colonial countries, but for historical reasons, which space does not permit one to go into here, it did not play the leading role in the freedom struggle and was itself largely under the influence of the national bourgeoisie. Yet it had developed a fair level of trade union consciousness and produced a Communist Party as long ago as 1925, with a definite and growing position among the people.

Now, some seventeen and a half years after independence, a situation has been reached where the national bourgeoisie, which is a heterogeneous ruling class, increasingly shows itself unable to solve the tasks of completing the national-domocratic revolution, while the working class is still quite a distance from establishing its leadership of the nation or even sharing leadership with the national bourgeoisie by breaking its present political monopoly. Hence the instability inherent in the Indian scene.

Economic Field

What do we find in the economic field? There has been quite a good rate of industrial growth, averaging about six to seven per cent a year over the past fifteen years. A number of new industries have emerged, like structural steels, machine-building, oil refining and production, heavy electrical equipment, railway engine production, chemicals and the like. It is also a significant feature of these industries that almost all of them are in the public (state capitalist) sector and largely developed through aid from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and other socialist countries. New trade patterns have developed, with the socialist camp accounting for some fifteen per cent of the total trade of India.

There are, however, some disquieting features of this industrial development that cannot be overlooked. The private sector is still preponderant in the field of industries and mining, with the public sector occupying only one quarter of this field. Moreover a considerable degree of concentration and centralization of capital has taken place. In the capital assets of the corporate private sector, amounting to Rs 3,000 crores*, two industrial-financial houses alone (the Tatas and Birlas) control Rs 600 crores. If we add to this the capital holdings of the Walchand-Hirachands, the Thapars, Goenkas, Snighanias, Mofatlals, we shall find that well over half the total capital assets are controlled by some seven or eight houses, with a fair amount of interlocking. For example a recent study showed that of 4,174 directorships over 2,000 were held by 44 persons and 520 others held the remaining 2,174. Banking capital has proceeded to such lengths that five big banks, effectively controlled by the industrial magnates mentioned above, have the bulk of the paid up capital of Rs 40 crores, by which they gather and utilize public deposits of rougly Rs 1,850 crores. These monopoly houses also own newspapers which account for some 75 per cent of the total circulation of all papers.

What makes the picture more menacing is that in the post-independence period, while the relative position of private foreign capital has declined, it has grown fairly rapidly in absolute terms. Non-banking foreign private investments have now reached the figure of nearly Rs 800 crores as compared with Rs 256 crores in mid-1948. The bulk of such investments—a good two-thirds—is from the U.K. In addition, imports of food from the U.S. under Public Law 480 have led to the accumulation of vast sums of money—roughly Rs 1,200 crores—in what are called counterpart funds under the joint control of the U.S. and Indian Governments, apart from fairly substantial funds under the exclusive control of the U.S. embassy.

---

* Rs. (rupees) 13.5 = £1 stg.; 1 crore = ten million.

In the past few years, we are witnessing increasingly close collaboration between the Indian and foreign monopolists, manifested in the high spurt of joint ventures as well as other forms of collaboration. In the third week of February this year the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry played host to the International Chambers of Commerce and Industry.* The junketings apart, a fair amount of success attended the efforts to establish unity of outlook and still firmer business contacts. No sooner was this over than the visit was announced of a team of top U.S. industrialists and bankers.

The picture has to be completed by adding that Indian Big Business has always had very close links with the top leaders of the ruling Congress party. Recently in the Parliament it was officially stated that in the past twelve years various private companies had *publicly* donated nearly Rs 10 millions to the Congress, accounting for nearly 70 per cent of all such donations. The top Indian magnates also occupy important positions in different 'public sector' companies and have built powerful lobbies among the top bureaucrats (many of whom are given lucrative directorships on retirement and whose close relatives are found comfortable berths in the most powerful Indian and foreign firms) and among the Ministers and members of parliament.

It would be wrong to conclude, however, that the monopolists, though they are the decisive element in the base and power of the Right forces in India, have already seized complete or even decisive control of the State. The non-monopoly sections of the national bourgeoisie have also registered considerable advance, especially in the field of ancillary industries growing up around the giant public sector projects. The public sector itself has entered certain fields of activity like state trading, insurance, banking and heavy industry, which prevent the unfettered expansion of the monopolists. Schemes have been announced and laws passed which would enable the state to convert loans to private industrialists into equity capital. Investigations have been made into the shady proceedings of some of the biggest private sector houses, with the likelihood of a take over of some units. As yet, foreign capital is not allowed to have a majority holding in new ventures, save as an exception. Certain fields of industrial development of crucial national significance have, thus far, been left exclusively in the public sector. A certain amount of success has attended the efforts to give financial and technical assistance to the medium and small industrialists, leading to a certain dispersal of industrial power. The socialist countries also extend aid not only to public sector projects but also to medium and small industrialists, apart from providing a market for some of their products.

---

* Disregarding India's official boycott policy an apartheid delegation from South Africa attended, headed by the secretary of the Chamber of Mines.—(*Editor*)

What we are witnessing today is a sharpening struggle between the monopoly and non-monopoly sections of the Indian bourgeoisie as the monopolists step up their drive to establish their leadership and complete control of the state. This sharpening contradiction has not yet, however, come anywhere near the point of rupture. Pandit Nehru acted as the unifier of the entire bourgeoisie as well as the main link between the class as a whole and the Indian masses. With his death a powerful cementing force has been removed. And this at a time when certain of the more deleterious aspects of the capitalist path of development have come to the forefront.

Inflation

In 1964 there was a sudden inflationary spurt, especially in the prices of food grains. It has been calculated that the *wholesale* price of rice rose by fifteen per cent, while that of wheat rose by over sixty per cent. There was a 'sympathetic' rise of other essentials of daily living. It has been officially estimated that if retail prices and truthful family budget surveys were undertaken, the rise of the cost of living in large and medium urban areas would be found to be not less than thirty per cent—the highest rise since independence.

What are the causes of the inflationary spiral? *First,* there is the slow rate of growth of the national economy as a whole. At the most optimistic, over the past decade the national income has grown at the rate of three-and-a-half per cent a year while the population has risen at the annual rate of two-and-a-half per cent.

Second, the rate of growth of agriculture has been particularly slow. In the nine years following 1952-53, food grain production rose at the rate of two-and-a-half per cent compound, while non-food grain production showed a four per cent compound rate of growth. This is above all due to the fact that the Congress government, while curbing and reducing feudalism, has totally failed to implement any kind of radical agrarian reforms that would give land to the tiller. It has, on the contrary, deliberately tried to create a hybrid kind of capitalism—converting semi-feudal landlords into capitalist landlords, encouraging a small stratum of rich peasants, and compromising with feudal and semi-feudal elements in the countryside, especially moneylenders and wholesale traders. As a result, studies officially undertaken by the Planning Commission show that the concentration of land ownership has not been broken and that a landlord-cum-moneylender-cum-wholesale trader type of exploiter still remains the most powerful figure in the rural areas. Consequently, parasitic production-relations still dominate the countryside.

Thirdly, note has to be taken of the fact that prices shot up in a year when food production had actually shown some rise after two years of stagnation and fall, and when food imports had also risen. While the sharp rise of Rs 525 crores in defence expenditure played an important part in inflation, the biggest factor was hoarding and speculation. Thanks to the government's wilful blindness a huge amount of 'black' money or undeclared income exists in the country. Conservative estimates place the amount at Rs 500 crores, while unofficial agencies are of the opinion that it would be nearer to Rs 3,000 crores—i.e., close to one third of the entire outlay on the Third Five Year Plan. Congress leaders themselves have publicly declared that this 'black' money is the basis of an invisible 'alternative government' which plays havoc with prices and holds the nation to ransom. It is the wholesale grain merchants, linked through the banks with the topmost monopolists, who have acted to deal out semi-starvation in the form of soaring food prices.

Workers' Struggle

The working class, led by the All-India Trade Union Congress and the Communist Party of India, took the lead in the struggle against the attempt of the ruling class to put the entire burden of its own failure on the backs of the people. Intense strike struggles and demonstrations heralded the resistance of the working people. The demands, to begin with, were for increases in dearness allowance commensurate with the rise in the cost of living index, as well as for the revision of this index itself. In the course of these struggles some gains were made, greater unity was achieved and new sections drawn in—government employees, teachers, doctors and other white-collar workers. Traditional forms of struggle were employed, like mass hunger strikes, deriving from the past struggle against imperialism.

This was followed by the great *satyagraha* struggle launched by the C.P.I. on an all-India scale towards the end of October, when over 25,000 went to jail, over 80,000 broke the law and some millions participated in the demonstrations. Never since independence had such a mighty action taken place simultaneously on an all-Indian scale.

Mention should also be made of the new form of struggle that has emerged in the recent period. This is the *Bundli* or close-down. In essence it is a combination of the general strike of the workers and the *hartal*—closing of shops, educational institutions and the like. The lead in this form of action has been taken by the great-hearted working class of Bombay where the C.P.I. was born. It has been followed up in other states as well. The unity of action achieved on a regional basis is now sought to be carried forward on an all-India scale. An all-India Struggle Committee has been established, consisting of leaders of most of the different trade union organizations. The move is to move towards *Bharat Bundli*—all-India closedown, on a certain day.

The militancy of the workers is displayed not only in the struggle but also in the platform advanced. This includes, as well as immediate demands of the workers, alternative national slogans, such as nationalization of banks, alternative forms of taxation, ceilings on income and the like. What is emerging in embryo form is the alternative to the present capitalist path of development—the national-democratic, non-capitalist path.

C.P.I. Split

The full potential of this rising wave of popular struggles is hampered by a new, distressing feature of disunity. This is the split within the C.P.I. itself which has led to the emergence of a rival Communist Party calling itself the C.P.I. (Marxist). There had been differences in the C.P.I. for some time on important issues of strategy and tactics, but matters had never reached the point of a split until the Chinese attack of October 1962, following which the leaders of the C.P.C. issued an open call for a split in the C.P.I. as the 'revolutionary duty of all true Marxist-Leninists'. From then on an important section on the C.P.I. leadership with a considerable following inside the Party and among the people, launched on a campaign of attacks on the leadership and eventually set up a rival Party.

In essence the rival C.P. accepts the ideological-political positions of the C.P.C. not only on the controversial issues confronting the world Communist movement but regarding the Indian situation as well. It has not openly stated this because of the differences in its own ranks as well as the unpopularity of China in India following the aggression against our borders in October 1962. In its programme it refuses to acknowledge the fact that India is an independent capitalist country but insists that it is more or less a semi-colony under U.S. tutelage. It refuses to acknowledge that there are national bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements in the ruling Congress party who have to be brought into the national-democratic united front. In fact it rejects the concept of national democracy and of the non-capitalist path as inapplicable to India and advances the concept of the strategic goal of people's democracy—a carbon copy of the Chinese revolution. It regards the Congress as a homogeneous reactionary mass and as the main enemy of the Indian revolution, against whom a united front has to be built in which even Right reactionary parties have to be given a place. On the one hand it advances extreme 'revolutionary' slogans and, on the other, is averse to launching the struggles of the masses around minimum demands and concrete national alternatives. It launches repeated campaigns against the C.P.I., criticising its national-democratic programme as a line of 'class collaboration.'

The C.P.I., at its recent Seventh Congress in Bombay in December 1964, decided that while an ideological-political campaign would have to be conducted against the rival C.P. and its organizational disruption combated, simultaneously a fraternal, persuasive approach would have to be adopted towards it, drawing it into united mass campaigns. A firm but patient policy was essential.

Thus, when towards the end of last year the Government suddenly swooped down on the leaders and cadres of the rival C.P., arresting some 900 of them under the obnoxious preventative detention emergency laws, the C.P.I. launched a vigorous campaign of protest through demonstrations and meetings, as well as resolutions in the Parliament and various state assemblies. It demanded that those arrested should immediately be released; if the government had any case it should try to prove this in a court of law. These arrests were a grave blow at parliamentary democracy and the fundamental rights of the people. They represented a diversion by the ruling party at a time when the people were surging forward in struggle. Unless the democratic forces mobilized they could become a prelude to a general attack on the entire democratic movement.

Kerala Election

The action of the Government boomeranged in the immediately following Kerala elections, which were held on March 4th. It will be remembered that in 1957 the C.P.I. formed a Ministry there following its victory in the General Elections. This Government was unconstitutionally removed in 1959 and in the following elections, despite receiving 40 per cent of the votes the C.P.I. was reduced to a minority position in the legislature because of the Congress combining with the Muslim League and Catholic Church to form an anti-Communist united front. Internal contradictions and the struggles of the masses broke up this front and brought down the Congress government in September 1964.

In the present elections, the rival C.P. emerged as the largest single party, with 40 seats in an assembly of 133. Twenty-nine of those elected on its ticket are in jail and its entire campaign was based on an appeal to the voters to register their protest against the undemocratic actions of the Congress. The Kerala electorate responded in a splendid manner. The C.P.I. fully backed this demand, at the same time putting forward its own programme. While it won some 600,000 votes, only four of its candidates were elected. It was quite evident that the arrests had created an atmosphere where the traditional supporters of the undivided C.P. felt it their duty to rally round the rival C.P. which was facing severe repression. It would be futile for anybody to claim that in Kerala the respective lines of the C.P.I. and the rival C.P. were being put to test. Civil liberties was the issue and those who had been most attacked by the Government earned the greatest sympathy of the people. At the same time it must be remembered that the Congress and its splinter group received some 45 per cent of the votes as well as some 60 seats. (The splinter Congress group arose from communal, factional rivalries and a coming together cannot be ruled out.)

Almost simultaneously with the Kerala elections, the ruling party was faced with a crisis on the language issue. This crisis was the product of the refusal of the Congress to accept the fact that the Indian nation is a composite one resting on the foundation of fourteen major nationalities, with their own developed languages and cultures. Without recognizing the equality of all 14 nationalities, without removing regional imbalances, any attempt at enforced unity is bound to break down.

Language Crisis

The C.P.I. had put forward a concrete programme for the solution of this tangled problem. It stressed that the main emphasis must be placed on the equal development of all the fourteen national languages. These should be made the languages of administration and of instruction in the respective regions, replacing English which is known by only two per cent of the population. In addition, gradually and with the consent of all the states, Hindi—which is the language of the numerically largest nationality (roughly thirty per cent of the total population) and which has affinities with the largest number of other national languages, because of a common Sanskrit root—should replace English as the link language. During the period of transition, English should continue as an associate link language. By and large, this was also the approach of Prime Minister Nehru. Following his death the majority of the central Congress leaders yielded to the pressure of the Hindi chauvinists and suddenly announced that as from January 26th this year, Hindi would be the official all-India language.

This roused justified apprehensions among non-Hindi nationalities, especially in Madras state. In Andhra, Kerala and Bengal also, feeling ran high. This fear felt by wide sections of the people was utilised by separatist, Right reactionary forces to unleash large-scale violence and mob hysteria. Instead of trying to assuage the ruffled feelings of the people, the Government resorted to shooting and called out the army. Well over 200 people were killed and crores of rupees worth of property destroyed before the central Congress leaders saw sense. Two central Ministers resigned and even the President of the ruling party voiced his opposition to the undue haste with which it was sought to impose Hindi. A political crisis of unprecedented dimensions emerged.

Eventually the ruling party had to retreat and to accept a position basically in line with what the C.P.I. had proposed. Even now, however, ambiguities and equivocation remain, with the possibility of fresh trouble.

India's Foreign Policy

With these pressing internal problems occupying the centre of the political stage it is only natural that insufficient attention is being paid to the role that India should be playing in the international crisis that has emerged with the eruption of U.S. aggression against Vietnam. The Government has correctly called for the immediate reconvening of the Geneva Conference and for a political settlement of the problem. But it has failed to go even as far as to condemn the U.S. air raids, let alone call for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam. Nor is this a mere accident.

The C.P.I. has pointed out that for some years now, serious weaknesses have emerged in India's foreign policy. While it remains a progressive policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism, in the main, it does not take a sufficiently firm stand against neocolonialist manoeuvres and flagrant aggression of the imperialists. It lags behind the radical Afro-Asian states and has lost its position of initiator and pace-setter. This was evident in the case of the Congo. It was evident in the long delay in recognizing the Algerian government. It was evident at the time of the U.S. aggression against Cuba. It is evident in the insufficient support given to the freedom struggle in the Portuguese colonies, as well as in Rhodesia and South Africa. It is evident in the case of Malaysia.

At the same time it is good that the Indian government is a signatory to the Cairo declaration; that it is playing an active role in the preparations for the second Afro-Asian conference, insisting on the representation of the Soviet Union; and that it maintains extremely friendly relations with the majority of socialist states. It is also excellent that it has refused to go in for the manufacture of atomic weapons, despite the Chinese explosion of one and the clamour of the Right forces that India should follow suit, as indeed she has the capacity to do. India has also refused to accept any kind of 'atomic defence' from the Western powers.

It is a marked feature of the present situation that a great deal of national-democratic unity has been achieved around the platform of the Afro-Asian solidarity and World Peace Movements. The former antipathy to these unofficial movements on the part of progressive groups in the Congress has been replaced by active co-operation. This is useful, not only in deflating the pressure of the pro-West Rightist forces, which are well entrenched in the topmost levels of the ruling party, but also in halting the vacillations of the Government itself.

India today is a living example of the failure of the capitalist path of development to solve urgent problems of national rebirth as well as to make a due contribution to the world-wide anti-imperialist advance. The forces pressing for an alternative national-democratic, non-capitalist path are in the preliminary stages of mobilization and unification. The C.P.I. is bending all its efforts for the speediest possible emergence of the national-democratic front. A period of sharp struggles, even of political crisis, is clearly ahead.

HYDERABAD, ANDHRA. *March 13th, 1965.*

DEMOCRACY AND AFRICA

A DISCUSSION

In the *African Communist* No. 19 (October-December, 1964) Mokwugo Okoye and P. Tlale opened a discussion on this theme. The colloquy is continued by a well-known British Marxist authority on Africa.

SOME COMMENTS ON ONE-PARTY SYSTEMS IN AFRICA

Jack Woddis

THE CONTRIBUTIONS by Mokwugo Okoye and P. Tlale on Africa, democracy, the one-party systems and the State, which appeared in the October/December 1964 issue of *The African Communist,* raise some very interesting questions which are the subject of current discussion throughout Africa and beyond. Much of the ground covered in these articles is generally accepted in Africa, and is appreciated by Marxists elsewhere. The comments I wish to make are not aimed at replying to any of the points made in these two articles, but rather to carry the argument a bit further and to examine more closely what is now happening in some of the African states.

My general views on the one-party systems in Africa have previously appeared at length, partly in my book, *Africa, the Way Ahead* (London, 1963), and more fully in *Marxism Today*, August 1963. In this latter article I stressed that there are two main types of single party independent African states—those which are progressive, and which are striving to complete the national democratic revolution and open the door to socialism; and those which express the striving of feudal and reactionary bourgeois elements to hold down the masses in the interests of the new ruling classes which are co-operating with imperialism. I pointed out that in a number of mass parties in Africa, which had led the people to independence, *a new stage had begun in which the differing class tendencies within the single party are contesting for leadership and mastery*. I then posed the following problem:

> The question of a single party or of two or more parties is not one of abstract, absolute principle. The decisive factor is what is to be the character of a single mass party? What will be its composition, its leadership, its policy, its ideology? In the conditions of present-day Africa, and because of the favourable world situation in which the forces of socialism are increasingly determining the direction of the march of all mankind, *it is possible that in a number of African states we will see the emergence of a new kind of mass revolutionary party, anti-imperialist in inspiration, embracing all the progressive forces of the nation, and progressively being won for the ideology of scientific socialism.*

I stressed at that time that one could not be dogmatic as to how these single parties would develop in Africa. It seems to me that what is necessary now is not so much a general analysis of what might or might not take place, but a concrete examination of African reality, a serious study of the actual changes taking place in a number of the one-party systems in African states.

P. Tlale, in his article, refers several times to the importance of the broad coalition of forces which carried through the struggle for independence and which is now faced with the task of completing the national democratic revolution. Thus, for example, he refers to 'the determination of the coalition of classes in the national front to pursue their revolution even after the transfer of power' (p. 69) and to the 'broad unanimity that has been achieved in the greater majority of the newly-independent states in favour of a non-capitalist path forward and for policies of a socialist nature' (p. 71). I have no quarrel with these formulations, which I think are correct, as far as they go, but I think one must study more closely the dialectics of change within the alliance and within the one-party systems themselves. P. Tlale correctly points out that 'when the time comes to tear up the roots of imperialism and introduce agrarian and other reforms, the difference in class interests comes more and more into the open' (p. 73). What seems to me specially *significant is that these differences are already finding expression and are resulting in important changes within the one-party systems.*

GHANA EXAMPLE

In Ghana, for example, as far back as April 8th, 1961, President Nkrumah found it necessary to issue his famous Dawn Broadcast in which he sharply criticized those leaders of the Convention People's Party who, he said, 'are tending, by virtue of their functions and positions, to become *a separate social group aiming to become a new ruling class* of self-seekers and careerists'. In a special message to a Seminar held at the Kwame Nkrumah Institute of Economics and Political Science, Winneba, on November 24th, 1962, Nkrumah drew attention to the new phase of struggle on which Ghana was embarking, and pointed out that in the struggle to 'liquidate the remnants of colonialism and imperialism', the people of Ghana would find that they had '*brought into focus the contradictions in (their) society*'. He then referred to '*certain individuals, and even groups, who, as a consequence of our struggle for independence and social transformation, have acquired some pretensions to economic power, and are so put out by our declared intentions as to want to obstruct our actions*'.

The opposition of these forces, and the growing drive of the masses and Government of Ghana to reconstruct their society, has resulted in profound changes beginning to take place within the Convention People's Party. Ghana celebrated last year the fifteenth anniversary of the founding of the Convention People's Party. This party was established as a militant fighting alliance of all the patriotic classes in Ghana, and its main aim was 'Self-Government NOW'. Having won its independence in 1957, successfully beaten off various imperialist plots and intrigues, and embarked on its far-reaching Seven-Year Plan, which is expected to lay the basis for socialism, Ghana is now entering a new phase of her struggle.

Her political leaders have stressed that, in this new phase, the role of the party will be enhanced and its function will change too. This has been underlined in an important editorial article in the Ghana weekly, *The Spark*. The article points out:

> The C.P.P. grew up as the instrument of the will of all sections of the people fighting for national independence. They were united into an irresistible force by the party which, steeled in action, won the political revolution, taking control of the state and all aspects of its operations out of the hands of the imperialist occupiers of our country and established independence.

But now, says *The Spark*, Ghana faces new problems.

> Our aim is socialism and there are different milestones along the road to it. On that road programmes and stages change. The party must see these

> changes coming, prepare the people for them and adapt itself to new conditions, too. It must play its role as a vanguard party, co-ordinating, mobilizing and directing the initiative of our people. As the aims of the party become more complex, the party has to grow to meet this challenge.

The article goes on to stress three main ways in which the party must be transformed. First, its aim and function:

> Today the party is changing from the Party of National Independence to the Party of National Reconstruction and Socialism.

This requires the party to be, in Kwame Nkrumah's words, 'the political vanguard of the people'.

Secondly, its composition. The party, as a vanguard party, will only grant the honour of membership to the most active, dedicated and honest people:

> The criteria for membership are the grasp of socialist ideology, the level of political consciousness, devotion and dedication to the socialist cause, ability to organize, influence and guide the masses in the general direction of socialism, transparent honesty, unadvertised self-sacrifice and a life of simplicity.

In order to create such a party, it says, care must be taken to control the *class* composition of the party:

> The truth must always be borne in mind that a party made up mostly of white-collar workers, civil servants and middle-class intellectuals will certainly not attain the national goal of socialism. Such an achievement can be the handwork only of the most revolutionary elements in our society, namely the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary youths. Therefore, much as we gladly welcome intellectuals and middle-class elements, who make the grade, into the fold of the one national party, the bulk of the membership must be made up of workers, peasants and the revolutionary youths. This objective we can achieve only through a careful regulation of admission into the party.

Thirdly, the article stresses the need to strengthen the ideological content of the party:

> Conviction is based on sound understanding and every party member must be helped to learn about the scientific basis of our revolutionary theory.

This theory, it states, is 'Marxism applied to the African situation, which will equip every party member to deal with problems in a scientific way, in a creative and correct way'.

THE ALGERIAN F.L.N.

The new role of the party was also one of the central themes in the remarkable report made by Ben Bella to the Algerian F.L.N. Congress in April last year. Ben Bella opened his speech by emphasizing the significance of the Congress, the first full Congress of the Party on the soil of independent Algeria.

> Up till now, we have kept going above all on the revolutionary drive of our masses, on their spontaneous action. Our forms of organization have been dictated by the demands of the situation and not worked out in any rational manner. In this sense, the present Congress constitutes a point of departure.

Ben Bella then analysed the most important changes that had taken place in the previous eighteen months. The Decrees of October 23rd, 1962, and of March 18th, 1963, annulled the purchase, sale or allocation of vacant properties, and ordained the return to the nation of land abandoned by the *colons*. This prevented the big Algerian landowners, the national bourgeoisie and war profiteers from enlarging their economic base and increasing their political power.

These decrees also opened the way to the initiative of the workers who occupied the farms and factories of their former masters and assured the continuity of production. Thus the workers' own self-management had become an accomplished fact, and this was recognized by the Government in its Decrees of March 22nd and 23rd, 1963, which gave legal sanction to the action of the workers. This meant, too, the emergence of a socialist sector of the economy. In October, 1963, large estates were nationalized, and this was followed by the taking over of the last land-holdings of the French settlers. A number of industrial enterprises, too, were taken over by the State.

Thus, in a very short space of time, the economic base of the former occupying power has been heavily diminished, and the door to the growth of the Algerian capitalist class considerably closed. This has created favourable prospects for Algeria's march towards socialism.

In this new phase, said Ben Bella, a new programme became essential, a programme which maps out a line of action which can be summed up as: 'A new economy. A new State. A new Party.'

Repeatedly, in his speech, Ben Bella paid particular attention to the role of the masses as makers of history, to the initiative of the people as the indispensable basis of revolutionary change:

> The largest and most deeply rooted participation of the Algerian masses has guaranteed the advance of the revolution and prevented it from getting bogged down in the rut of compromise. This alone can guarantee its future. Our duty lies in bringing to it the unity and clarity which symbolize a revolutionary party.

He went on to point out that 'the participation of the masses is a necessary condition for arousing their consciences', and that 'it is in the course of struggle, in all its forms' that the people will find the instruments and institutions which best allow them to participate. This involves, too, the development of the ideological struggle against mistaken ideas. Such a struggle is needed to help rouse the people's conscience. 'If the struggle against reactionary ideologies is not waged mercilessly, the most radical masses remain powerless.'

Thus, the role of the party is decisive, 'the most important feature of our work'. Ben Bella pointed out that

> **At the beginning of the war of Liberation, the F.L.N. was made up of various currents, guided by different philosophies. . . . Today it appears in a new light, thanks to the revolutionary measures taken by those in power. . . . Today it is no longer a question of reviving the F.L.N. in its past form, but starting from what already exists, of forging an instrument capable of defending and promoting socialism on a massive scale . . .** our country needs a driving force. This driving force is the single party, a party conscious of the interests of the working masses, a determined party which gives real support to all initiatives by the people.

Ben Bella spent considerable time dealing with the role of the party, on the need to fight for the line of the party, to base the party on the principles of democratic centralism, on the role of the party as the advance-guard of the masses, on the necessity for the cadres to maintain close links with the masses and to deal concretely with their problems.

Of special interest is his treatment of the party's social composition:

> The social composition of the party raises some questions of principle. The draft rules lay down that a party member must not exploit the labour of others. With the progress of the building of socialism the exploitation of labour will recede. But we still have exploiters among us, and the spirit of exploitation. **Our party cannot tolerate exploiters penetrating its ranks without the risk of degeneration and 'bourgeoisification'.**
>
> **The draft rules also lay down that the party must draw its strength from the peasants and workers. That goes without saying. Socialism aims first at the liberation of these social forces. It is their democratic organisation, their activity within the party, which will make its strength. This year, we must make it a rule to accept only poor peasants and workers into membership, so as to strengthen the work of the party at the point of production.**

THE CONFLICT IN GUINEA

In Guinea, too, there have been important changes within the Democratic Party, which reflect very much the conflict within the party between the new bourgeois forces who want to enrich themselves and hold up the advance of the country, and the majority who want to press ahead and make important changes. For the past few years there has been a considerable to-and-fro in relations between the main forces contending within the party. At the end of 1964 important decisions were taken to crack down against some of the bourgeois elements in Guinea; all private traders have had their import and export licences cancelled, trade has once again become (as it did at first after independence in 1958) a monopoly of the State Trading Corporation, and severe measures have been announced to tighten up against smuggling.

In drawing attention to the reasons for the new measures, President

Sékou Touré exposed the fact that for the past six years big traders had been engaged in black market operations, and in smuggling, and had made use of considerable funds outside the country. He also announced that there would be a check on the property in the hands of every Guinea citizen since 1958; all goods fraudulently acquired would be confiscated for the benefit of the people.

It is significant that simultaneously with the announcement of these new measures to restrict the bourgeoisie, it was also announced that *sweeping changes would be made within the party. Membership of the Democratic Party of Guinea will from now on be restricted to 'activists who have proved themselves'*. In future, no private traders or managers can occupy a leading post in the party either at the centre or in the localities. Central and provincial commissions have been set up to investigate and expose sources of enrichment, particularly among political and administrative leaders. Party members must now be over eighteen years of age, and engaged in productive work. A drastic reduction in party membership has already taken place; in the capital, Conakry, for example, membership is being limited to 30,000 people. Thus, formerly a mass party for national independence, embracing practically the entire population, the Democratic Party of Guinea, is being transferred into an advance guard party of revolutionaries, with its edge turned against the trading bourgeoisie who have been endeavouring to take advantage of the situation in Guinea. The conflict between the two trends in Guinea is not yet resolved, but anyone wishing to understand the one-party system there must take this conflict into account.

TREND TO SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

Another important manifestation of the conflict between the two trends in the one-party systems is seen in the ideological conflict between the advocates of 'African socialism' or 'Arab socialism' on the one hand, and those who stand by the concept of *scientific socialism.* The Party Rules adopted by the Convention People's Party of Ghana, shortly after independence in 1957, spoke of 'African socialism' as the party's aim. But when it became increasingly obvious that this term was being used by those who wished to separate Africa from other socialist countries, and to prevent the creative application of generally valid Marxist principles to African conditions (and, even more significant, as a mask behind which neo-colonialism and *capitalism*, not socialism, were to be fostered), the C.P.P. abandoned the term. Thus, the new programme of the C.P.P. adopted in 1962 says that its ideology 'is based on scientific socialism'.

In Mali, too, the ruling party, the Sudanese Union, bases itself on scientific socialism. The 1964 Congress of the party adopted a resolution, calling for the setting up of a Higher Party School whose syllabus would take account of 'the specific historical, economic, cultural and social features of the Mali Republic, Africa and the whole world, the history and principles of the party, and the *principles of scientific socialism*, without the knowledge of which no leader can effectively solve the problems of building socialism in our country'.

This Party School is being established in Mali with the assistance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In a letter to the C.P.S.U., at the end of January 1965 expressing his thanks for this help, President Modibo Keita wrote: 'Our party regards as an invaluable advantage the possibility of using the priceless experience and support of the C.P.S.U., which, having built up socialism, is leading the Soviet Union to a Communist society.'

Of special significance, too, is the speech of President Nasser to the U.A.R. National Assembly, on November 12th, 1964, in which he no longer referred to 'Arab socialism', but stressed that 'it is the working class which represents the socialist system', and went on to explain in these terms:

> There is another point: scientific socialism as we perceive it and as defined by the Charter is the proper formula for proper progress. I wish to stress this point. It has been said that scientific socialism is heresy and Marxism. I have heard it myself and I think many of you have heard it, too. 'What does scientific socialism mean?' some people ask. 'Ours is an Arab socialism, not scientific socialism.' This is of course untrue. When we read in the press that a football team has lost, we say that in order to win in the future it must train scientifically. This principle applies to everything in life. If we want to have a proper and successful socialism it must be applied scientifically.

In Congo (Brazzaville), too, where there is an entirely new situation since the overthrow eighteen months ago of the puppet Youlou régime, the trade union centre and the party refer to scientific socialism as being the basis of their activity.

In Uganda no one-party system yet operates, but within the main national party, the Uganda People's Congress (U.P.C.), one can see expressions of the same battle raging between the supporters of scientific socialism and those who, behind a mask of 'African socialism' or 'democratic socialism', are striving to prevent Uganda taking a path away from capitalism and towards socialism. This conflict broke into the open last year, at the April Congress of the U.P.C., when the right wing, on the basis of anti-communism (and by a number of underhand tricks to inflate their voting strength at the Congress) managed to secure the removal of the General Secretary, John Kaconge, a founder of the party and an open exponent of scientific socialism, and so strike a temporary blow against the most consistently anti-imperialist trends in the party.

In Tanzania, too, there are advocates of scientific socialism. Here, the banner of scientific socialism has been raised in *Vigilance Africa* (*Tuwe Macho*), a new fortnightly journal which carries a banner head—'For Scientific Socialism and African Unity, Against Colonialism and Imperialism'. This is still, however, a minority trend within the Tanganyika Africa National Union (TANU), the ruling party.

The developments in the single parties of Ghana, Algeria, Guinea and Mali, as well as the developments taking place in Congo (Brazzaville), and in the U.A.R., constitute a valuable enrichment of the treasure-house of knowledge of the international working class and socialist movement, and a creative addition, in very practice, of revolutionary theory.

It had previously been believed in some circles that African peoples wishing to advance to socialism would have to set up their own Communist Party, organizationally and ideologically separate from the single national party. The formation of such Communist Parties has taken place in some African countries, and may become necessary in some others. *But experience shows that in a number of African states, as the peoples drive from independence to complete their national democratic revolution and advance towards socialism, possibilities can arise which facilitate changing the class composition, character and ideology of the single, mass parties, transforming them from broadly based national parties into consciously socialist parties based on Marxism-Leninism, and increasingly led by the working people.*

All who are seriously concerned with developments in Africa should study closely the further evolution of the African political parties, the relation of forces within them, and the pronouncements of their leaders. It is only by a regular examination of the actual experiences of these parties, and by constantly re-checking and re-assessing what is actually taking place, that Marxists can really contribute to our understanding of the African revolution.

LONDON: 25.1.1965

AFRICA

Notes on Current Events

UGANDA The Government of Uganda has protested vigorously against aggressive actions by armed forces of the Tshombe régime at Leopoldville in bombing Ugandan border villages from the air. Tshombe denied these charges but accused Uganda of plotting against his Government, claiming that his white mercenaries had captured 'several Ugandan soldiers' in unsuccessful battles near the border. He threatened further action against Uganda.

* * *

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Basil Bataringaya, together with five members of his Democratic Party, has joined the ruling Uganda People's Congress, giving Dr. Obote's Government an overall majority in Parliament. The U.P.C., with thirty-four members in Parliament, had been governing with a minority. The six new members of the party say their action in changing parties was an attempt '. . . to build true unity and kill tribalism'.

* * *

LEOPOLDVILLE Seventeen teachers serving in the Congo under the aegis of UNESCO have been expelled by the Tshombe Government on allegations of complicity in a 'communist plot'. The teachers, thirteen Egyptians, a Spaniard, a Pole and a Syrian, are alleged to have acted in conjunction with Algeria. Expulsion orders were signed by President Kasavubu and Interior Minister Godefroid Munongo.

* * *

The Belgian Government has sent a letter to all Belgian company owners in the Congo (Leopoldville) asking them to transfer all shares in their companies to the Tshombe Government. The Belgian Government, it was said, would indemnify the owners. This Tshombe-Belgian agreement, negotiated in Brussels, affects particularly the rights and concessions of the Belgian Comité Special du Katanga, a concessionary company of Union Minière, whose mineral and land rights were abolished last November. Tshombe, meeting the company representatives immediately after announcing the agreement with the Government, told them that the new position would not mean 'spoliation' or expropriation for the company. He did not explain what it did mean. Union Minière handed Mr. Tshombe the first pay-off cheque the same day, £650,000 representing dividends formerly paid by Union Minière to the Comité Special, which held 24 per cent of Union Minière shares.

Shortly before the pay-out agreement with Belgium, press statements said that Mr. Tshombe had gone to Brussels to negotiate with the Belgian Government for increased aid in the military struggle against the Congolese liberation forces, which have inflicted heavy losses on the Tshombe forces, and maintained their control of large sectors of the country.

* * *

BURUNDI Mr. Pierre Ngendandumwe, Prime Minister of Burundi, was shot and killed in the capital, Bujumbura, in mid-January. Seven men were arrested, amongst them Mr. Albin Nyamoya, a former premier who had just been dismissed from his post, and the country's chief of police. The country's ruler, Mwami Mwambutsa IV, who had dismissed Mr. Nyamoya on grounds of '. . . many mistakes and grave omissions in both internal and external affairs' was reported to be seeking a *rapprochement* with Mr. Tshombe, and the restoration of diplomatic relations with Leopoldville. 'The King,' says the report to the London *Times*, 'is obviously now relying on the loyalty of 1,000-strong, Belgian-officered Army to maintain calm . . . and may decide he is strong enough to take firm action against communist elements in the country'.

* * *

TANZANIA Before Tanganyika and Zanzibar united there was a mission from the German Federal Republic (West Germany) in Dar es Salaam, and one from the German Democratic Republic—it was one of the first foreign governments to recognise the Revolutionary Government—in Zanzibar. In February President Nyerere's Government decided to end this anomaly by raising the status of the G.D.R. mission and permitting a consulate-general to be opened in the federal capital, Dar es Salaam. This, like Premier Walter Ulbricht's highly successful State visit to the United Arab Republic, was a serious African blow to West Germany's self-proclaimed 'Hallstein Doctrine' which forbids foreign countries to recognize the Berlin Government on pain of excommunication by Bonn. West German President Erhard informed Tanzania that the Federal Republic would consent to the G.D.R. representative staying on in Zanzibar with the rank of consul but not to his being admitted to the mainland.

Tanzania stood firm on principle. Tanganyika was once a German colony; its rulers are sensitive to this revival of the imperial type of language from Bonn, nor are they prepared to concede to West Germany or anyone else the right to decide Tanzania's diplomatic policy. The Erhard Government thereupon announced the ending of military aid to Tanzania, consisting of arms and instruction valued at £3.6 million. President Nyerere's response was quick: he called for the immediate termination of all other West German aid as well.

* * *

RHODESIA Commonwealth Secretary Bottomley and the Lord Chancellor, Lord Gardiner, held talks with the white minority Smith Government and also with tribal chiefs on Smith's payroll, who for the most part echoed the Smith line of 'independence' under white rule. Some chiefs told the British delegation, at the carefully stage-managed meeting, that the liberationist leaders like Nkomo and Sithole 'are only children of ours; they are not the leaders of the people'. The chiefs themselves, they said, 'are the true and hereditary leaders'.

Mr. Joshua Nkomo, ZAPU leader, was brought from his detention camp to meet the British delegation under guard and with strict security conditions. The ZANU leader, Rev. Sithole, is serving a prison sentence for 'incitement', and the delegation had been told in advance that they would not be allowed to meet him, but they did meet ZAPU second-in-command, Mr. Takawira. Both ZANU and ZAPU spokesmen demanded the immediate calling of a new and representative constitutional conference; the release of all political prisoners and detainees; and the immediate introduction of universal suffrage. Majority rule should be instituted immediately—by force if necessary—they said.

Reporting to the House of Commons, Mr. Bottomley said 'it is not our intention to impose majority rule by force'. 'We have no intention of interfering with the convention that internal affairs are conducted by the Rhodesian government.' But he added that this 'convention' would be respected only 'as long as there is no unconstitutional action' (e.g., a unilateral declaration of independence) by the white Rhodesians

He also said in reply to Mr. Michael Foot, that he had made proposals to the Smith Government for steps towards majority rule, in terms of the decisions of the last Commonwealth Conference, and also representations for the release of prisoners and detainees held without trial.

* * *

On February 17th a 30-man Portuguese trade and technical delegation was received in Salisbury by Ian Smith, who pledged close alliance between the White Rhodesian minority and fascist Portugal. This marked the beginning of a 10-day conference of white delegates from Rhodesia, Lisbon, Angola and Mozambique, devoted to achieving closer co-operation in all fields, including military arrangements between these centres and Pretoria. The conference is regarded as a further stage in the Verwoerd plan for a closer military and economic tie-up of white colonialism, including the eventual formation of a 'Southern African Common Market.'

MALAWI Dr. Banda's Government has taken further extraordinary powers of repression, in amendments to the Preservation of Public Security law. To do, say or possess anything that is likely to '. . . prejudice security, undermine the authority of or public confidence in the government' or to promote industrial unrest is now punishable with up to five years' imprisonment. In a series of denunciations of his opponents, Dr. Banda has accused the Tanzanian Government of assisting his former minister Kanyama Chiume, to plot an invasion of Malawi, and to train anti-Banda exiles for guerilla warfare against his government. He has threatened to increase the number of people held in Malawi prisons and detention camps without trial 'to 1,000 if necessary', in order to end opposition to his Government. 'The world can say we are a dictatorship, but I am going to rule this country,' he added. 'I will not have seditious and parasitic clerks in Zomba.' Some weeks later, he accused the Zambian Government of lending support to the anti-Banda forces and of aiding the emigré ministers headed by Mr. Harry Chipembere in their campaign against the Banda regime.

Further security regulations to deal with what Dr. Banda described as 'armed rebellion' were announced in February 'to crush Chipembere's rebellion ruthlessly and without mercy'. Guerilla forces it was said had carried out a series of attacks against police and other Government installations in the Fort Johnson area, which Dr. Banda claimed had been frustrated by the speedy action of his security forces. The country, he said, had been saved by the British officers leading the security forces, and he called on the whole people, including the

Malawi Young Pioneers to rally behind the leadership of the security forces. The new security regulations empowered the security forces to search, challenge, arrest or shoot anyone without warrant, on suspicion of subversion.

At the beginning of March, Dr. Banda claimed that 'more than half of the rebel army led by Mr. Chipembere' had been captured, and that the rebellion had been crushed. The 130 men who had been captured would be charged with treason. The remainder of the force, he said, had split into small groups and taken to the hills and forests. Security forces were 'mopping up'.

* * *

The Minister of Finance disclosed that, at the end of the year 1964, Malawi's deficit was £1 million higher than had been expected, and totalled £5¼ million for the year. Britain had undertaken to provide £9¼ million in aid in 1965, of which the bulk would be used to cover the expected deficit, and £3 million only would be available for development. The increased deficit has been caused not by increased Government spending, but by the fall in the price of tea on the world markets. Expenditure will be allocated to new roads (£1¼ million), education (£1 million) and agriculture (£1 million), with £1.2 million to promote industry in the private sector.

* * *

ZAMBIA Three prominent members of the Malawi Congress Party were deported from Fort Jameson to Malawi in February, after a number of border incidents. The Zambian Broadcasting Corporation said that the deportations had followed attacks by members of the Malawi Young Pioneers on Zambian border police.

President Kaunda, at a press conference in January, reiterated that his Government would not nationalize the copper mines, but would certainly make new arrangements with the copper companies about royalty payments since the Government had acquired the rights formerly held by the British South Africa Company.

Shortly afterwards, the B.S.A. Company (Chartered), Rhodes' company, which had long been the real ruler of Northern Rhodesia, announced that it was withdrawing completely from Zambia. A verbal agreement had been reached for the company to sell its real estate and buildings to the Government. No details were given of the agreement, which covers a complete African township and several large office blocks. The B.S.A. Company would merge with two large South African mining-financial companies, Central Mining and Consolidated Mines Selection to form a new company, Charter Consolidated Ltd., which will have interests in milling, mining and other fields in Zambia, as well as ventures in other parts of Southern Africa.

* * *

The Zambian Government has given twelve months' notice of its intention to end the trade agreement now operating between Zambia and South Africa. Mr. Mundia, Minister of Commerce, described the trade agreement with apartheid as 'repugnant', but said that his Government had decided it would honour the clause requiring twelve months' notice.

During the last nine months of 1964, 1,253 prisoners being held in Zambian jails for political offences have been released, according to figures given by President Kaunda. His Government felt that their continued imprisonment was unjust. They had been sentenced before the country gained its independence.

* * *

ANGOLA A Swiss banking corporation has given a loan of £12½ million to the Portuguese Government for use in Angola. The loan is guaranteed by the Portuguese Government, and will be used, it is said, for the purchase of industrial machinery and equipment 'from European sources', within the framework of Portuguese 'development' plans for Angola.

* * *

ALGERIA A newly-formed Federation of Workers on the Land, called on the Ben Bella Government to speed up its programme of agrarian reform, and to break up the remaining large estates in Algeria for distribution to landless peasants. President Ben Bella has said that the land reform programme will be completed before the end of 1965.

* * *

KENYA For the first time, an African will head the Kenya police force. President Kenyatta has announced the appointment of Mr. Bernard Njenga Hinga as Chief Commissioner of Police, in succession to Sir Richard Catling. Mr. Hinga has been Director of Intelligence in Kenya's police since the beginning of last year.

GHANA A general election for an enlarged Parliament will be held in Ghana before July 1, President Nkrumah has announced. This will mark the end of the five-year period of office of the present Parliament.

Dealing with cocoa exports, the President said that Ghana's cocoa production had expanded tremendously, exports had risen considerably, but 'the manufacturers and speculators in the cocoa trade have taken advantage of this to depress the price'. As a result, Ghana has had a deficit in balance of payments, export earnings had fallen and imports had increased, especially of plant and equipment for development programmes.

* * *

SUDAN The Revolution of October 21st, 1964 which overthrew the Abboud military dictatorship has suffered a temporary setback. The revolution was carried through by the National Front, led by the Communist Party and other patriotic forces of the working class, the intellectuals and the peasants. It led to the formation of an all-party Coalition Government to prepare a general election. But at the end of February, Premier Ser al-Khatim Khalifa formed a new so-called all-party Cabinet, offering the Communist Party only one seat (previously they and their allies had held five) and weighting the Cabinet heavily in favour of the right wing parties—Umma, National Unionist, Southern Front and Muslim Brotherhood. The left-wing parties have refused to join on terms which they declare are a breach of the constitution. *New Age* (New Delhi) comments: 'What has happened is the result of imperialist plot and machinations. . . . Clashes were organized against the non-Arab Negro minority in the South which gave rise to retaliation. . . . A campaign was let loose by the conservative elements to bring about an atmosphere of religious fanaticism. . . . It was no mere coincidence that the high point of this reactionary upheaval was made to coincide with the State visit of the British Queen. . . . Imperialism's strategic interest in the Sudan is obvious. A progressive government in Sudan with its common frontier with the Congo can seriously undermine imperialist interest there.' Meanwhile plans are going ahead to conduct 'elections' on the basis of a voters' roll dating back to the period before the Abboud regime, which would exclude a whole generation of progressive youth.

DOCUMENTS

DOCUMENT I

A MESSAGE FROM UNDERGROUND

Bram Fischer

ADVOCATE ABRAM FISCHER, Q.C., is the main accused in the current Johannesburg trial of thirteen men and women on charges of being members or supporters of the illegal Communist Party. On January 22 he announced that he had chosen to forfeit his bail and leave his home in order to continue the liberation struggle from underground. The following message sent by him from 'somewhere in South Africa' has been released by *Southern Africa News Features*, London.

IN 1965 SOUTH AFRICA presents a surface of ebullient confidence: the ebullience of a white electorate basking in phenomenal prosperity; and the confidence of a Government which, during sixteen years, has with increasing violence attempted to crush every effort by the majority of the people to win human rights until today it appears supremely stable.

To the outside world, then, South Africa may seem to be another Spain: irrevocably set for long years of rule so tyrannical that all militant opposition can be continually and readily suppressed. A powerful body of conservative opinion—including the many British and American investors with a large stake in this prosperity—particularly appreciates the present Government's maintenance of 'law and order' (regardless of the cost in human suffering below the surface) and argues that economic forces are breaking down apartheid.

These impressions and arguments need to be corrected.

South Africa may resemble Spain, but it is not another Spain. Apartheid, in a manner unique in history, arouses the abhorrence of all the United Nations except Portugal; not only the abhorrence, but the growing determination to bring to an end such racial domination. The view may be true that many investors in South Africa favour a strong Government, and hence resist any interference with the policies of such a Government which attempts to maintain law and order at all costs. This view may be true *at present*. It ceases to be true as soon as the Government's policy produces unrest and external threats. At that stage it must become increasingly apparent that it is in the interests of the investor to support rapid change and the transfer of political power to a truly representative government which would establish racial peace and proper relations with the African States and the United Nations. In any event, can any government be truly stable where, in a multi-racial society, all non-whites, three-quarters of the population, are deprived of the vote and detest the racialist laws? Can any economy long be stable where its prosperity is reserved for a politically dominant white minority? Can any policy produce racial harmony where it imposes economic and social degradation and a denial of human rights on the vast majority of people?

As for the argument that economic forces are breaking down apartheid, this is true only to a strictly limited extent. The law reserving jobs for whites and coloured people is daily infringed as more and more non-whites are absorbed into skilled and semi-skilled work, while during the Nationalist Government's rule the number of Africans living and working in so-called white areas has more or less doubled. But—though their wages and living conditions improve—in face of the ever-rising cost of living, need, poverty and malnutrition remain the lot of the vast majority of non-whites in this prosperous country. Furthermore, the absorption illegally of Africans into semi-skilled or even skilled work is in fact leading to even greater exploitation of labour, as white employers hire them for so-called white jobs at cheap wages, safe in the knowledge that Africans have no right to organize and strike. But above all the argument that economics are defeating the politics of apartheid becomes fallacious in face of the mounting human and political repression that has accompanied the growing 'influx' of Africans, now more than 7,000,000 in the so-called White

87 per cent of South Africa. In short, the more educated and "industrialized' the Africans become, the more they are repressed.

It is not necessary to look far below South Africa's surface in time or depth to discover the reality. Protests against shocking social conditions, against the hated pass laws, against political and industrial oppression—whether peaceful or whether exploding into riots or sabotage—have equally been put down with violence.

Yet for fifty years, the senior African organization, the A.N.C., followed a policy of non-violence. Even after the Sharpeville massacre, it still persisted in such methods. Not until the 1961 protest stay-at-home had been crushed by all the force of a modern well-armed State, did the leaders turn away with bitter regret from their policy of non-violence, and allow some members to join the Spear of the Nation. Even then the campaign of sabotage that followed was directed strictly at symbolic targets. Once again the reply of the exclusively White Parliament was not to repeal discriminatory laws. Instead, surely a unique occurrence in history, an elected body whose members must have known full well what the consequences would be, passed a law which legalized torture. Under the so-called 'ninety-day' law, which soon earned world-wide notoriety, a thousand of our best citizens were detained for indefinite periods of ninety days in solitary confinement, for purposes of interrogation. As was to be expected, this has been used (and, though suspended, can at any time be used again), not merely to inflict solitary confinement—in itself one of the cruellest forms of punishment, as I know from personal experience—but for actual physical torture; long hours of enforced continuous standing—forty hours, fifty, sixty or even more—during incessant interrogation; electric shock treatment and other forms of violent physical assault.

Our police State, now arming itself to the teeth, has used this law with barbarous intensity to try to break the forces striving for basic human rights. Today there are over 2,500 political prisoners in our jails, including most of our non-white leaders. The State thinks it has crushed the liberation movement, but it has not. As we know from history—including the history of South Africa—if the struggle for freedom is smothered in one place or for the time being, it flares up again before long. In 1960, with the mass arrests during the Emergency, it seemed as if the struggle had been crushed. But this was not so. There was a resurgence in the movement for liberation. Now of course the set-back has been more profound and widespread. But 'set-back' it is, and the struggle will surge forward again. It is in this that the real danger lies. If South Africans have to perform the task by themselves, they will inevitably be driven by the terrorist methods of the the State into a violent and chaotic form of struggle. And the more prolonged the daily, incessant humiliation meted out by the majority of whites, to the millions of non-whites, the fiercer the bitterness being created in millions of souls. This bitterness is understood, indeed overtly shared, by people of colour everywhere. The fury recently vented in the United Nations over the Congo will seem trivial by comparison to what lies ahead in relation to South Africa. Though it is at the moment beyond the powers of the African States to launch any direct attack they cannot indefinitely tolerate our gross insult to man solely because of his colour and their existing influence in the United Nations can but grow and, in its turn, influence the countries with heavy investment in South Africa.

Immediately, world opinion has positive and constructive tasks to perform. It must prevent torture from being used again in a country which counts itself civilized. World opinion has already helped to bring about the suspension of the ninety-day law, now it must work for its repeal. The law still exists and the Minister of Justice has already threatened to reimpose it at a moment's notice.

World opinion should work for the release of our thousands of political prisoners and, until this is achieved, must insist that they are not, as at present, treated as ordinary criminals of the lowest category. The wives and dependants of these prisoners must be cared for; their children educated. We in South Africa are quite incapable of looking after 15,000-20,000 dependants.

But, most important, is the extension of human rights to all citizens. Democracy will eventually be won, of that there can be no doubt. The question is whether it can be achieved peacefully or only by violence.

A peaceful transition can be brought about if the Government agrees to negotiation with all sections of the people and, in particular, with the non-white leaders at present jailed on Robben Island or in exile. Prospects of such negotiation seem desperately remote. The Government presents a "granite" attitude. Not one of the three Prime Ministers produced by the Nationalist Party since 1948 ever met or talked with a single non-white leader.

Yet this is no static situation. This is no Spain. It is 1965—not 1935. If the combination of predictable and unpredictable forces leads to large-scale violence or war, the consequences would be so disastrous in loss of life, in suffering, in economic disruption, in a legacy of bitter hatred and in the threat to world peace, that I believe that white South Africans must at some stage be brought to realize that their own long-term interests lie not in maintaining race supremacy but in extending human rights to all.

Although the Nationalist Party appears supremely confident, its spokesmen show some awareness of the hopelessness of their struggle in their warnings that if apartheid fails, multi-racial democracy must follow.

The United Nations can bring home to white South Africans the recognition that the maintenance of white supremacy is doomed. I doubt even whether it would be necessary to apply sanctions, boycotts, embargoes. I have no doubt that if white South Africans really believed that certain fundamental sanctions would be imposed after the lapse of some specified time, they could well rid themselves of apartheid, and thus avoid bloodshed more fearful than ever occurred in Algeria.

And knowing them as I have grown to know them from twenty-five years work with the A.N.C., I have no doubt that our African people will gladly bear any hardships that would be caused by sanctions, rather than achieve their freedom by violence.

With *all* South Africa free, at long last our country will fulfil its great potential—economic, political, cultural and educational—internally and in African and world affairs.

DOCUMENT 2

STATEMENT BY CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES IN MOSCOW

A CONSULTATIVE MEETING took place in Moscow from March 1st to 5th, 1965, of representatives of the Communist Party of Argentina, the Communist Party of Australia, the Brazilian Communist Party, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the United Party of the Socialist Revolution of Cuba, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Finland, the French Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Communist Party of Germany, the Communist Party of Great Britain, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Communist Party of India, the Italian Communist Party, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Syrian Communist Party.

Representatives of the Communist Party of the United States attended the meeting in the capacity of observers.

The participants held consultations on questions of mutual interest and exchanged opinions on ways and means of surmounting differences and consolidating the unity of the world communist movement.

The consultative meeting proceeded in an atmosphere of fraternity and friendship and was imbued with the spirit of active struggle for the unity of the communist movement to fulfil its great historic tasks.

The participants expressed the firm determination of their parties to do everything in their power to rally the world communist movement and consolidate its unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the course laid down in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The representatives of the parties agreed that under present conditions the strengthening of the positions of socialism, the upsurge of the national liberation and the international working-class movements, and the growth of the forces standing for the maintenance and strengthening of peace, is the basic trend in world development.

At the same time, it was noted that world reaction, and in the first place U.S. imperialism, is becoming more active in various parts of the world trying to aggravate the situation and undertaking acts of aggression against the socialist countries, the states liberated from colonialism, and the revolutionary movement of the peoples.

In this situation it is more than ever necessary for all Communist Parties to show their sense of internationalist responsibility and to unite for the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, and against the rule of monopoly capital, for active support to the liberation movement and defence of the peoples subject to imperialist aggression, and for the struggle for world peace based on respect for the sovereignty and integrity of all states.

In a statement the participants expressed their solidarity with the heroic people of Vietnam and the Party of Labour of Vietnam, and issued a call for international solidarity in the struggle against the aggressive acts of the U.S. militarists.

Cohesion of all the revolutionary forces of our time—the socialist community, the national liberation movement and the international working class—is of decisive importance for the success of the fight against imperialism.

This cohesion calls insistently for the strengthening of world communist unity.

Divergences in the communist movement impair its unity and therefore do damage to the world liberation movement and the communist cause.

The participants voiced their conviction that what unites the Communist Parties greatly outweighs that which at the present time disunites them.

Even though there are differences over the political line and many important problems of theory and tactics, it is quite possible and necessary to work for united action against imperialism and to render all-round support for the liberation movement of the peoples, in the struggle for world peace and the peaceful coexistence of all countries, big and small, with different social systems, and in the fight for the vital interests and historic goals of the working class.

Concerted action in the fight for these common goals is the most effective way of overcoming the existing differences.

The participants stressed that the Communist Parties must exert collective efforts to improve relations between the parties and to consolidate the unity of the world communist movement on the basis of the observance of the democratic principles of the independence and equality of all the fraternal parties.

In the struggle for the solution of the tasks common to the whole of the communist movement, it is desirable to exploit all possibilities and ways, bilateral and multilateral meetings between representatives of fraternal parties and other forms of party contacts and exchanges of opinion.

The participants are unanimous in the opinion that under present conditions, as is declared in the 1960 Statement, international meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties are an effective means of exchanging views and experience, enriching Marxist-Leninist theory by collective effort and working out united positions in the struggle for common aims.

Such meetings, held with the observance of the principles of complete equality and independence of each party, can render good service to the cause of surmounting differences and cementing the unity of the communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Therefore, in the opinion of the participants, active and all-sided preparations for a new international meeting to be held at a suitable date, fully conform to the interests of the world communist movement.

To convene the new meeting and to secure its success, it is necessary to prepare it both as to its content and from an organisational standpoint, actively to create by joint efforts favourable conditions for all fraternal parties to participate in its preparation, and to work tirelessly for an improvement of the atmosphere in the world communist movement.

The meeting should serve the common cause of all communists. Emphasis and concentration of efforts on the urgent tasks confronting the communist movement will, more than anything else, bring our positions on the fundamental issues of the time closer together.

The participants expressed the opinion that it is desirable to hold a preliminary consultative conference of representatives of the 81 parties that gathered at the 1960 meeting in order to discuss the question of a new international meeting.

It is necessary to hold consultations with all these parties to decide the question of convening this preliminary conference.

The parties represented at this meeting have declared themselves in favour of discontinuing the open polemics, which are in character unfriendly and degrading to the fraternal parties.

At the same time, they consider it useful to continue, in a comradely form and without mutual attacks, an exchange of opinion on the important contemporary issues of mutual interest.

The participants declare themselves in favour of the rigorous observance of the standards governing relations between parties as defined by the 1957 and 1960 meetings, and against the interference by any party in the internal affairs of other parties.

In expressing their opinion on the ways of surmounting the difficulties in the world communist movement and on its further development, the representatives of the parties were guided by the wish to strengthen the Marxist-Leninist unity of the communist ranks in the fight against imperialism and colonialism, for national liberation, peace, democracy, socialism and communism.

The representatives of the parties trust that all fraternal parties will respond favourably to this consultative meeting.

WHAT OUR READERS WRITE

SOUTH AFRICAN LITERATURE

— *A Rejoinder*

We have as usual been receiving a full post-bag of appreciative letters from readers in various parts of Africa and many other parts of the world as well. Space, in this issue however, does not permit us to do more than thank everyone who has written to us—especially those who also enclosed donations towards the costs of producing this journal—and to ask you to keep on writing. We have also received a lengthy letter from *Joseph Mofolo Bulane,* a South African student abroad, in connection with an article in our October-December 1964 issue—*Across the Colour Line*—Some Thoughts on South African Literature, by Scheepers Fourie. Because we wish to encourage free exchanges of opinion we have devoted the whole of this section of our journal, this time, to Mr. Bulane's contribution: even so, we have had to shorten it quite a bit. In fairness, we should point out that 'Scheepers Fourie' is a pen name; the writer is not necessarily an Afrikaner, or white.

Mr. Bulane writes:

> A fault of much writing by progressives in South Africa, however, seems to be their preoccupation with the exploration of the non-white people and their lives, and the attempts to present solutions to the 'race problem' thereby, overlooking the fact, apparently, that there exist people other than blacks who have problems. It is high time

> that a work about life as the white people themselves truly live it today, was written. This would be an admirable contribution to South African literature.

Thus writes Scheepers Fourie. There are too many flaws in S. Fourie's article, flaws of too serious a nature to be ignored by any devoted student of the history of letters. Above all, these shortcomings on S. Fourie's part cannot be brushed aside by a committed African student whose life has been intrinsically bound up with the pangs of the black masses in South Africa, now groaning, as everybody knows, under a supremacist regime that has outraged opinion in every corner of the progressive world.

How, at this stage of the national liberation movement, can S. Fourie blame his progressives for devoting their energies to depicting the African life in South Africa and attempting to solve the *race problem*? For him the inverted commas are necessary to show his attitude towards the race problem in South Africa. He is talking of people *other than blacks,* other than *die swart mense,* as the Afrikaner contemptuously calls the Africans in South Africa. He is disgruntled that, according to him, the white man's life in South Africa has been hidden from the world.

But the white man in South Africa does not have problems, that is, such problems as S. Fourie would like to shout to the world. *To speak of the white man's problems in South Africa and to seek to counterpose them with those of the African, or the oppressed majority of the non-whites, is to stride before the world in all the perverted and erroneous views of a downright reactionary and an apologist of racial supremacy.*

S. Fourie is in raptures over the Afrikaner poet, Uys Krige, who, S. Fourie should like to think, has brought his people, the Boers, to life on paper. Uys Krige's people are none other than S. Fourie's people, 'the Afrikaner people as human beings, ordinary people who like all others suffer the attacks of life. . . .' Is there any need to comment? S. Fourie equates 'a sense of genuine internationalism' with Uys Krige's so-called attempt 'to lift Afrikaans out of mere South Africanism'. He does not even take the trouble to substantiate this wild statement.

AFRICAN AUTHORS AND WHITE POETS

S. Fourie's progressives are all the white authors of South Africa he has reviewed in his own way. To him, the African author is a mere short story writer.

Such outstanding African literary figures, statesmen and patriots as Dr. John Dube and R. R. Dhlomo are referred to merely as the authors of *'several books in the vernacular'* (my italics). They are biographers of Chaka, Dingaan, Cetewayo, etc., he alleges, adding that their books are the forerunners 'of African nationalism in the literary field'. Although he does not drive this point home in his article, the African nationalism referred to might be associated, *in a way,* with those South African writers of whom he says:

> They demand freedom as a birthright, and unlike their white contemporaries, they have no 'racial problems' to solve by way of idealistic or 'controversial' debate. These are the writers of revolt, who have no qualms about combining art with the struggle for emancipation and democracy.

This is at page 83.

What does he say of these writers of revolt? Nothing. He does not take the trouble even to mention in passing Mphahlele's *Down Second Avenue* or *The African Image,* not to mention the many short pieces he used to contribute to the now defunct *Fighting Talk.*

S. Fourie fails to see that the non-white writer, sharing the scourge of colour discrimination and ruthless oppression with the rest of the non-white masses, directs his creative process within a concrete historical context. Aware of the stark reality of the South, the non-white author has been able to reach down to its grass-roots.

He makes one other devastating statement in connection with some African authors. At page 81, in speaking of Dr. Dube and R. Dhlomo, he alleges that their greatness consisted in that *they did not reject the artistic influence of white poets like Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Byron.*

It would have been appropriate to refer to those poets as English poets. S. Fourie, in his narrow-mindedness, labels them 'white' to prove the white man's indispensable rôle in the development of things African. He is quick to observe that the Afrikaner Uys Krige has explored Afrikaans folk-lore. He is blind to the fact that the African poet, indeed the Zulu poet, is exploring the rich Zulu folk-lore and the rich Zulu idiom. Dhlomo's lyrical epic, *The Valley of a Thousand Hills* is permeated with the Zulu oral poetic tradition, the *izibongi.* This valley to Dhlomo, says Mphahlele, symbolizes the hope and despair of the black man.

The artistic influence which S. Fourie sees in the works of the Zulu authors is due to the fact that English poetry has become part of the treasure-trove of world culture. It is not a question of being 'white poets'. These colour definitions, when lifted out of their narrow South African context, become ridiculous. The Zulu poet was not slavishly following in the footsteps of the 'white poet'.

Scheepers Fourie does not mention, for instance, that Dhlomo put up fourteen plays in English before his death. How can a serious review of South African literature and culture omit Peter Abrahams's *The Path of Thunder, Wild Conquest, The Blacks;* Alfred Hutchinson's *The Road to Ghana;* Albert Lutuli's *Let My People Go;* Trevor Huddleston's *Naught for Your Comfort*?

Alan Paton in *Cry the Beloved Country,* it is true, has been deeper and more forthright in depicting the demoralising nature of the exploiting world of capitalist relations in South Africa. Alan Paton has shown the iron grip on the rural African of the impersonal world of industrialisation and the callousness of the colour bar. Apart from suggesting that the best place for the African is the bush, the reservoir of cheap labour for South African industry, Alan Paton does not see the solution to the South African situation. He says:

> When that moment shall come of our freedom from the fear of bondage and the bondage of fear, why, it is a secret.

S. Fourie simplifies the South African situation to that of 'race problem'. It is a political, economic and social struggle for the oppressed non-white majority. This race problem, which exists in the United States and Britain, although in varying forms, has its roots in the economy of the country.

Speaking of literature in 'the vernacular', as though there were a single African language in South Africa, S. Fourie omits such a classic in the Xhosa language as A. C. Jordan's *The Wrath of the Gods*. In connection with this A. C. Jordan's *magnum opus,* Mphahlele rightly notes that it should be viewed as a larger irony of the multi-racial society, where pigmentation of one's skin is a criterion. One notes also the absence of Nyembezi and Vilakazi in Fourie's lop-sided, half-hearted review of South African literature. One would also like to have seen the name of Dennis Brutus, the jailed poet who won a prize in a competition sponsored by Mbari in Nigeria.

How can S. Fourie forget the young men who used to rally around the Johannesburg *Drum,* a flashy magazine of monopoly capital, some of whom, now embittered and hardening in exile, have emerged as authors: Lewis Nkosi's *The Foreign Corn,* Todd Matshikiza's *Chocolates for My Wife,* Bloke Modisane's *Blame me on History,* and Arthur Maimane's *Homecoming* and other short stories?

There is something Chekhovian and, therefore, brilliant in the sweeping brevity and psychological depth of *Homecoming*. The nameless hero, a typically South African prototype, is a concentrated depiction of the fate of many an African hero in the bitter struggle being waged against the police dictatorship of a white-supremacist state. Such literature seeks to topple the applecart of *baasskap*, white supremacy, because, behind the author's pathos, his sympathy and passionate love for his hero, there are deep undertones that involve the author in exile as a participant in the raging struggle of the underdogs.

REFORMS NOT ENOUGH

S. Fourie, at page 77, wishes to think that the struggle in South Africa belongs to *the oppressed non-white masses demanding equality, freedom and democracy for all*. To speak of equality, freedom and democracy for all is to imply that the non-white masses in the South are still snoring in the gloomy night of bourgeois limitations, not outpacing the throaty calls for reforms. Reforms are nothing but the preservations of the old order. We are living in that period of world history when it is impossible to view the South African situation in isolation from the rest of the world. The forces at work in the Southern Republic must be viewed as a part and parcel of the typhoon raging over the face of the African continent which, in turn, is related to the conflagration consuming Asia and Latin America. The struggle in South Africa is of the magnitude of a national liberation movement. Whether he likes it or not, the African is heading for political power.

Fourie makes a final somersault, like an acrobat, towards the tail of his article. This starts with the painful admission by him at page 84 that

> In the main it is the non-white writer who has come nearest the truth of the South African situation.

His explanation for this, however, is unsatisfactory. The proper explanation is at page 90 of the same issue of *The African Communist*, in connection with Mbeki's book:

> And it is only in Mbeki's book that one is presented with the picture of African resistance. . . . It is Mbeki's close ties with the people, his years of experience of their problems and their struggles, which make his book so valuable.

Speaking of South African literature in general, it is only an African author, with his roots among the people, that can best tell the people's aspirations, their sorrows and enjoyments, their ideals and problems. More than that, in South Africa the course of history has been such that the African author—the non-white author—is drawn into the vortex of the struggle with his whole being. He is being discriminated against. He is being exploited. He sells his labour at the common market, including the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association, that Moloch of mine labour, at Eloff Street Extension. Because of his intellectual level, supplemented with revolutionary world outlook, his reaction is sharp, quick and unrelenting. This is not to idealize or to suggest that the non-white in the South always reaches the grass-roots of the bleeding ulcer. It is only being suggested that S. Fourie's progressives, for the most part, are still flogging a dead horse and barking up the wrong tree.

THE WHITE INTELLECTUAL

Curiously enough, in what sounds almost like an afterthought, S. Fourie dethrones his progressives at the same page 84:

> The white intellectual, whose political, social and economic superiority is maintained, whether he likes it or not, by the colour-bar . . . may . . . search for 'solutions' to the dilemma of South Africa . . . but his cultural and intellectual attacks have hitherto been confined to the superstructure of society. . . .

To conclude, S. Fourie has not treated his subject in its socio-historical context. He is not aware that the work of art, including literary work, must embrace concrete facts having to deal with a given historical period in the development of mankind. The literary characters, to be worth anything, must belong to a definite historical epoch and reflect in themselves the social trends and contradictions of that particular epoch in a given society. Hamlet, King Lear, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Childe Harold, Evgeny Onegin, Belikov, Tartuffe, Faustus. . . . Not having grasped the historical aspect, S. Fourie bundles Olive Schreiner's *The Story of an African Farm,* Alan Paton's *Cry the Beloved Country,* and Athol Fugard's *Blood Knot* together. He is not aware that all these works, whatever literary defects they may have, fall within different phases of the stark South African reality. Each of them is a product, finished or unfinished, of the period of human relations and forces of production to which it belongs.

The Story of an African Farm, at the present stage of the South African struggle in particular, has little or no meaning at all. Its Tant Sannie, a brutal, corpulent, inhumane farm-woman, tortures and flogs *Swartbooi*—Black Boy—a pitiable, helpless, crushed, kind-hearted, innocent creature of the colonial literature, a farmhand of an underdog. Since life is forging forward and science is developing, the creative power of man has not ceased to function. On the contrary, with the new phenomena of life, with humanity moving from one phase of development to another, new heroes, new underdogs—new Swartboois if you want—have emerged. [Note: Olive Schreiner's Swartbooi was not necessarily black.]

The Story of an African Farm, to prove its acceptability to the supremacist regime, was a set-book for the Joint Matriculation Board of South Africa in 1956, controlled by Pretoria. Olive Schreiner is still much a member of her own superior race and class.

What is the fate of Fugard's *Blood Knot* in the South? What chances are there for it to be screened or staged so as to reach the widest possible audience?

To bid S. Fourie farewell: Despite some inklings of Marxism, he is still emotionally attached to *herrenvolkism*. His attempts to free himself from the horizons of colour considerations are thwarted by his gravitations towards the platteland mentality. His literary style is too dilute; his shabby ideas too scattered, like broken pieces of glass; and his metaphorical sword too blunt to pierce the thick, pinkish skin of the pig-headed South. He would do better to study Mphahlele, who outdoes all his progressives put together.

THE GERMAN IDEOLOGY

K. Marx, F. Engels

First complete English translation of the great work in which Marx and Engels first formulated their mature views on philosophy and human history.

25s

ON COLONIALISM

K. Marx, F. Engels

A collection consisting largely of despatches to the American Press on British expansion in India and China.

5s

ON RELIGION

K. Marx, F. Engels

Some of these extracts are available in English only in this collection.

6s

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET STATE

V. Lenin

These statements made by Lenin fully define his conception of the relations between socialist and capitalist states.

7s 6d

AGAINST REVISIONISM

V. Lenin

A collection bringing together various works and extracts.

6s 6d

LAWRENCE & WISHART

Printed by
Farleigh Press Ltd.
(T.U. all depts.)
Watford
Herts

the road to
SOUTH
AFRICAN
FREEDOM
ac

This booklet, the programme of the South African Communist Party, presents a straightforward Marxist analysis of Apartheid, and the fight for South African freedom in the background of the African Revolution.

Paperback: 1s. 6d. post free

Library edition (hard cover): 8s. post free

SPECIAL PACKAGE OFFER: The Road to South African Freedom *plus* one year's subscription to The African Communist, 7s. post free (5s. post free in Africa).

Order from:

ELLIS BOWLES

52 Palmerston Road, London, S.W.14, England